THE RHETORIC OF THE APOSTLE PAUL AND THE PROPHETS:

A COMPARATIVE STUDY

by

Charlotte Culver Streight

A Dissertation Presented to the
FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
(Speech Communication)

June 1977

Copyright © by Charlotte Culver Streight 1977

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY PARK
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007

Ph. D.
Sp
'77
S915
v.1

2473B
m

This dissertation, written by

Charlotte Culver Streight

under the direction of her Dissertation Committee, and approved by all its members, has been presented to and accepted by The Graduate School, in partial fulfillment of requirements of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Harold von Hofe
Dean

Date March 4, 1977

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

Walter R. Fisher
Chairman

James H. McBath

John P. Crossley, Jr.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS viii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1

Statement of the Problem 1
Significance of the Study 7
Justification of the Study 8
Purpose of the Study 8
Limitations and Scope of the Study 9
Stylistic Elements 10
Review of the Literature 11
Organization of the Study 13
Method of the Study 14

The nature of rhetorical analysis 17
Logos and mythos--the ancient dispute . . . 20

II. THE WORLD OF PAUL 30

The Historical Setting 30

Introduction 30
The political setting 40 B.C.-A.D. 96 . . . 32
The social setting 36
The religious setting 43
The form and precepts of rhetoric in the Greco-Roman world 55

The second sophistic 73

The Mind of Paul 79

Early Jewish, Greek and Roman influence on Paul and His oratory 81

Jewish influences on St. Paul 82
Greek and Roman influences on St. Paul 89

Chapter Page

The Appearance of the Apostle Paul 94
The Personality of the Apostle Paul 99
The Conversion Experience of Paul 105
Other Elements in the Philosophy of the Apostle Paul 118

III. THE RHETORIC OF SAINT PAUL IN ACTS 13 146

The Historical Setting 147

The synagogue 147
The audience 148

The Biblical Exposition 149

The text of the sermon 149
The content and organization of the sermon 151

The theme and purpose of the sermon . . . 152
The structure and outline of the sermon 153

Arrangement and Development of Ideas with Emphasis upon Logos 154

The Rhetorical Analysis 166

The response to the sermon 166
The appropriateness of the theme to the occasion and audience 167

The appropriateness of the theme to the occasion 168
The appropriateness of the theme to the audience 174

Structure of the sermon 182
Analysis of style and delivery 197
Analysis of pathos and ethos 210

Summary . . . .

IV. THE RHETORIC OF AMOS 231

The Historical Setting 232

The political setting 236
The social setting 238
The religious setting 241

Chapter Page

The Biblical Exposition 247

The text of the sermons 247
The content and organization of the sermons 247

The theme and purpose of the sermons . . 247
The structure and outline of the sermons 251
Arrangement and development of ideas with emphasis upon logos 252

The Rhetorical Analysis 266

The response to the sermons 266
The appropriateness of the theme to the occasion and audience 267
The structure of the sermon 269
Analysis of style and delivery 273
Analysis of pathos and ethos 293

Summary 303

V. THE RHETORIC OF SAINT PAUL IN ACTS 17 316

The Historical Setting 318
The Biblical Exposition 329

The text of the sermon 329
The content and organization of the sermon 330

The theme and purpose of the sermon . . . 332
The structure and outline of the sermon 333

Arrangement and development of ideas with emphasis upon logos 335

The Rhetorical Analysis 350

The Response to the Sermon 350

The response of the Athenians 350
The response of Paul 355

The appropriateness of the theme to the occasion and audience 369
The structure of the sermon 375

The poetic quotations 382
The philosophical allusions 388

Chapter Page

Analysis of style and delivery 407
Analysis of pathos and ethos 424

Summary 439

VI. THE RHETORIC OF HOSEA 465

Theories concerning Hosea and his marriage 468

The Historical Setting 471

The political setting 473
The social setting 475
The religious setting 477

The Biblical Exposition 481

The text of the sermons 481
The content and organization of the sermons 481

The theme and purpose of the sermons . . 481
Structure and outline of the sermons . . 485
Arrangement and development of ideas with emphasis upon logos 487

The Rhetorical Analysis 497

The response to the sermons 498
The appropriateness of the theme to the occasion and audience 502
The structure of the sermons 505

Lack of logical arrangement: suggested divisions 506
Lack of one definite climax 509
Presence of conflict 510
Presence of logical appeals 512
Lack of sequence 513

Analysis of style and delivery 515
Analysis of pathos and ethos 537

Summary 555

VII. THE RHETORIC OF SAINT PAUL IN ACTS 20 571

The Historical Setting 572

Paul's journey to Jerusalem 572
Paul's summoning of the Ephesian elders 575

Chapter Page

The Biblical Exposition 577

The text of the sermon 577
The content and organization of the sermon 579

The theme and purpose of the sermon . . . 579
The structure and outline of the sermon 579

Arrangement and development of ideas with emphasis upon logos 581

The Rhetorical Analysis 592

The response to the sermon 592
The appropriateness of the theme to the occasion and audience 600
The structure of the sermon 602
Analysis of style and delivery 609
Analysis of pathos and ethos 625

Summary 637

VIII. THE RHETORIC OF MICAH 651

The Historical Setting 653

The political setting 654
The social setting 655
The religious setting 657

The Biblical Exposition 659

The text of the sermons 659
The content and organization of the sermons 659

The theme and purpose of the sermons . . 659
Structure and outline of the sermons . . 660
Arrangement and development of ideas with emphasis upon logos 661

The Rhetorical Analysis 663

The response to the sermons 664
The appropriateness of the theme to the occasion and audience 667
The structure of the sermons 667
Analysis of style and delivery 669
Analysis of pathos and ethos 686

Summary 693

Chapter Page

IX. SUMMARIES, COMPARISON, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY 703

Summaries 705

The world of Paul 705
The rhetoric of Paul 706

The response of the audience to each sermon 707
Appropriateness of themes to occasion and audience 708
The structure of the sermons 709
Analysis of style and delivery 715
Analysis of pathos and ethos 718

The world of the prophets 722
The rhetoric of the prophets 723

The response of the audiences to the sermons 724
Appropriateness of themes to occasions and audience 724
The structure of the sermons 725
Analysis of style and delivery 727
Analysis of pathos and ethos 730

Comparison of Rhetoric of Paul and That of the Prophets 733

The response of the audience to the sermons 734
Appropriateness of themes to occasions and audiences 734
The structure of the sermons 735
Analysis of style and delivery 736
Analysis of pathos and ethos 738

The Conclusion 742
Implications of the Study 747
Suggestions for Further Study 750

APPENDIXES 755

A. The Jewish Lectionaries
B. The Historical Study of Acts 17
C. The Unknown God
D. Figures of Speech in Hosea

BIBLIOGRAPHY 796

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her grateful appreciation for the valuable assistance rendered by the many persons contributing to this study. She is particularly indebted to Dr. Walter R. Fisher for his guidance and continuing inspiration. To her husband, Glen, the author is deeply indebted for constant encouragement and patience while the work was being done.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

William Cleaver Wilkinson declares that "among the preachers of the Christian past, later than Jesus, one figure stands out to the historical eye, salient, unique, incomparable. That figure is the Apostle Paul."[1] And Swartz declares:

> There have been many eloquent preachers since his day, but the world has not yet seen his equal. The very planet feels his tread, the air yet vibrates with his speech, and his influence is felt throughout the world.[2]

The preaching of the Apostle Paul was undeniably eloquent, providing examples of powerful rhetorical elements in the New Testament that are worthy of study.

Statement of the Problem

Walter A. Jennrich asserts that a careful consideration of rhetorical elements in the New Testament is needful and valuable. He believes that neglect of such a study has been due to the erroneous idea that the times of the writing of the New Testament were illiterate: barren of Greek literature. He argues, however, that the period was actually one of high cultural standards, rhetorical eloquence, and wealth of literature which doubtless served as background for the New Testament, and potentially had a greater influence on Scriptural style and oratory than many scholars have suspected.[3] He holds to this view in spite of such recorded statements as that of Gregory of Nyssa (d. A.D. 395) who declared that the great apostle Paul surely deemed it a shame to use the Greek world's formal rhetoric rather than the truth alone.[4]

Eduard Norden further observes that Paul abjured "eloquent wisdom" and "lofty words" at a time when the art of speech was highly favored.[5] Other scholars have supported Gregory of Nyssa and Norden, asserting that Paul's eloquence was learned through his study of the Hebrew Scriptures and the teaching he received from home and synagogue. A strict Jewish family would not allow their son to be exposed to such pagan influences as those abounding in Tarsus.[6]

While it is true that a sense of the sacred and the highest type of eloquence seem to go together, other scholars refute the belief that Paul wrote and spoke solely from Jewish tradition and divine inspiration. They believe his natural and his inspired eloquence were guided and sustained by the Greek rhetoric to which he must have been exposed as a child, and again in later manhood. Certainly Tarsus, believed to be Paul's home city by many, though not all scholars,[7] was perfectly suited to the needs of one whose chosen mission would require the blending of Judaic and Hellenistic thought. Although its schools could scarcely rank with the famous universities of Athens and Alexandria, Tarsus, according to Strabo, the Greek geographer, had more enthusiasm for education than did either of these greater cities.[8] At the beginning of the Christian era, Tarsus was at the height of her prosperity and fame. A great number of her sons

> had attained eminence in every field of intellectual activity. These included the Stoic philosophers Antipater, Archedamus, Nestor Athenodorus Cordulia, Cato's teacher of the Emperor Augustus; also Nestor the Academis, the teacher of Marcellus, the son of Augustus' sister Octavia, and other philosophers; grammarians, too, like Artemindorus and Diodorus; and poets like Dionysius the tragedian.[9]

Thus, whether a Greek-speaking Tarsian attended the university or not, he could not escape the prevalent hunger for Hellenistic learning. Furthermore, Havernak explains, at Tarsus, the capital of Cilicia, East met West as perhaps in no other city of the Roman Empire. Vessels plied regularly between Egypt and Asia Minor. The port of Tarsus was routinely filled with ships of every coastal city in the empire, bringing, among other passengers, famous theologians and philosophers from Alexandria, who often spoke in public squares to Greeks and Hellenistic Jews alike.[10] Ramsay says Paul must have often heard, in his own hometown, many such philosophers as those he encountered in Athens.[11] Thus, Paul's home and community life brought together the Hebrew religion and Greek philosophy.

> It is unlikely that Paul would have become the great Christian missionary if his home had not been in this wider Judaism, if he had not been able to read and write Greek and possessed the Septuagint as his Bible, if he had not been used to accommodating himself to foreign customs.[12]

Diasporian Jews, such as Paul, had more contact with Gentiles in business and social transactions than did the Jews in Judea, and even worshipped with many Gentiles who would join them in the synagogues. Paul's family, though strong in the Jewish faith, had been granted free citizenship in the Roman empire, and therefore, could not be as strict in their separation from the Gentiles as were the Jews in Judea. Hellenistic Jews had special seats in the Greek gymnasium and Paul writes as if he has observed the Greek games. He could hardly have kept from observing the public pageants and passion plays, and perhaps even saw the drama of Greek theater. He may also have been allowed to study at least the elementary exercises in a Hellenistic school near his home: exercises which were "planned to prepare a boy for subsequent advanced instruction in rhetoric and ultimately for an active life in public affairs."[13] Whoever lived in Tarsus and spoke Greek,[14] as Paul did, breathed the Hellenistic spirit no matter what his faith or nationality.

Richard B. Jones, entering the scholarly dispute, asserts:

> If there is anything that is certain, it is that Paul was not Palestinian, he was Saul of Tarsus, a Grecian Jew. It is as such that he thinks and writes. If he had been brought up in Judea "according to the strict manner of the Law" his knowledge of Greek would have

> been at most superficial and meager. Even the accomplished Josephus never fully mastered Greek, and complains that his Jewish education discouraged it. In Judea, he says, learning consists of being fully acquainted with Mosaic Law, and Proficiency in its interpretation.[15]

Duncan adds:

> The Apostle of the Gentiles was learned in Greek letters, as Moses, the lawgiver of the Jews, his counterpart, was learned in the wisdom of the Egyptians; and he did not give up that learning when he had "learned Christ."[16]

Further, Woffron states, "The Almighty sometimes works by Miracle, but commonly He prepares His instruments by methods of this world."[17] In fact, Paul himself indicates that his background has equipped him well for his mission when he says, "It was the good pleasure of God who separated me, even from my mother's womb . . . that I might preach Him among the Gentiles."[18] Paul goes out of his way three times to quote passages from Greek literature: once, speaking to the pagan Athenians; another time, to his converts at Corinth, and a third time, in a private Apostolic exhortation to his disciple Titus.[19] "And it is the more remarkable that one of the writers whom he quotes seems to be a writer of comedies."[20]

Before his conversion, Paul's mentality must have been essentially dialectical. Given certain principles, he pursued them to their ultimate logical consequences. For example, compressed into a brief sentence, one of Paul's dialectical arguments is that Israel fell in order to rise. Though St. Ambrose exclaimed:

> Not through dialectics has it pleased God to save His people. . . . not in disagreement of speech. . . . redemption can never be the result of a dialectical process,[21]

yet when Paul proclaims, "God has shut up all in unbelief, that He may have mercy upon all,"[22] no other term can characterize this truth than dialectic.

However, the emphasis upon Paul's Hellenistic environment is not to overlook the fact that he was also steeped in the tradition of his fathers and was a Pharisee, schooled by the doctors of the Law in the Synagogue. There, teaching was often conducted by the question-answer method, but public speaking was extemporaneous and unstructured.[23] It has been conjectured that Paul left Tarsus for Jerusalem to study under Gamaliel, at about the age of fifteen, for his parents were rather wealthy[24] and able to give him an excellent education. Several times he translates from the Hebrew Scriptures;[25] yet usually he uses the Greek version, the Septuagint. At other times he appears to rely upon his memory, for his knowledge of the Old Testament was extensive and indicates close study. Gamaliel, the eminent Jewish Pharisee, theologian-teacher, was liberal-minded and tolerant.[26] He himself was trained in Hellenistic philosophy, literature, and rhetoric, in order to be of greater use to his sect.[27] Thus, by education as well as birth, Paul belonged to three different worlds:

> His Roman citizenship gave him a position of some standing in the great Roman empire to which the civilization of Hellenism gave unity. . . . Paul was brought

> into contact with the body of scribes in Palestine. Thus he was at the same time a Roman citizen, a Hellenistic Jew, and a Jerusalem scribe.[28]

Significance of the Study

The stature of Paul and his brilliant powers of persuasive speech are sufficient to make a study of his rhetoric significant. Paul is the dominant figure of the early Christian Church. More of his writings and sermons are extant than those of any other person mentioned in the New Testament. He had more influence in spreading Christianity to the Gentile world of the first century than any other person, as evidenced by Luke's account of Paul's work. Anyone who can speak with the power and impact with which St. Paul spoke is worthy of examination, study and emulation. Paul's powers of speech won him a hearing before noblemen and rulers (Acts 24:10; 26:2), before men of philosophy and learning (Acts 17:18), and before business people (Acts 16:14), soldiers (Acts 21:37,38; 22:25-29), sailors (Acts 27:21-26), and the common man (Acts 21:29; 22:2; 26:22). There is no question about his ability as a speaker.

> The effect of his first recorded sermon at Antioch in Pisidia, which brought the whole city to listen to him on the following Sabbath (Acts xiii.44); the burning eloquence which filled the conscience-stricken Felix with fear and awe (Acts xxiv.25); the impassioned oratory which moved Festus to exclaim that he was mad (Acts xxvi.24);[29] the persuasiveness which fascinated and kept quiet a howling mob of Jews thirsting for his life (Acts xxii.2);--all these tell the same tale, and assure us that among the many and outstanding gifts possessed by the Apostle, that of speech was not the least. High Roman officials, Jewish kings, crowds of heathen, whether among the dilettanti of Athens or the

8

peasants of Lystra, all acknowledge the power of that magic voice.[31]

To the pagans at Lystra there was but one name which could do justice to the brilliance of Paul's eloquence--Hermes, the messenger of the gods (Acts 14:12)!

An investigation of the sources of the rhetoric of the Apostle Paul, then, is surely important, and will help to determine the place of classical rhetoric in transforming a local Hebrew sect into an expansive international faith.

Justification of the Study

This investigation is justified because it is an original study of the sources of Paul's rhetoric in relation to traditional Hebrew prophecy and to classical rhetorical precepts. It bridges a gap between the rhetoric of early Hebrew prophets of the Old Testament, and the New Testament rhetoric of St. Paul, first prophet of Christianity. Such a study also reveals whether or not new spiritual experiences require a totally new method of communication, or simply a building upon or reshaping of traditional methods.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study, then, was to contribute to an understanding of the rhetoric of St. Paul by discovering what influence, if any, the precepts of classical rhetoric had upon his speeches. The exact questions to be answered were: What elements found in the rhetoric of the Apostle Paul are also found in Old Testament Hebrew prophetic rhetoric, as seen in Hosea, Amos, and Micah? Are there rhetorical elements in Paul's speeches that are not found in the traditional Hebrew rhetoric? If so, can these "added" elements be recognized as those which are also a part of classical rhetoric? Perhaps Paul's exposure to classical precepts of rhetoric, along with his intelligence to absorb and utilize them, mingling them with traditional Hebrew prophetic speech, resulted in the rhetoric that is peculiarly the Apostle's.

Limitations and Scope of the Study

The Biblical record of the rhetoric which is peculiarly Paul's probably does not represent the complete text of what was originally said. Paul was often given to long sermons (Acts 20:7-12; 28:23); yet any one of the messages in Acts 13, 17, or 20 can be read through aloud in just a few minutes. Many scholars have been struck by this "tantalizing brevity,"[31] and have suggested that Luke's reports are compressions of the original messages. Robertson cautions, "One must bear in mind that the reports all bear evidence of great condensation."[32] Cadbury writes, "The speeches that we have are all relatively brief and succinct and capable of explanation as summaries of longer addresses."[33] And McGarvey maintains: "All of these speeches are obviously only epitomes of the originals, very greatly abbreviated, such as could be remembered and reported by the speakers, or even by their hearers."[34] Most students of the New Testament are agreed, therefore, that the reports in Acts are synopses or compendiums of the original speeches.[35]

It is still possible, however, to believe that the record in Acts produces the actual words that Paul spoke. While acknowledging the abbreviated nature of the report, one can at the same time concur with the statement of Conybeare and Howson: Luke "has evidently preserved, if not _all_ the words, yet the _very_ words uttered by the Apostle."[36] Luke may not have reported everything Paul said, but what he did report, Paul did say.

F. F. Bruce asserts, "The textual evidence for the New Testament is abundant beyond all comparison with . . . other works" and "The Old Testament text is astonishingly well attested as compared with Herodotus and Thucydides . . . it does not suffer even by comparison with Homer."[37] Sir Frederick Kenyon agrees: "It cannot be too strongly asserted that in substance the text of the Bible is certain. Especially is this the case with the New Testament."[38] Furthermore, McGarvey declares:

> It has been clearly demonstrated by scholars who have taken the pains to search into the phraseology of these speeches, and to compare them with the epistles of the speakers, that in the speeches of every speaker who has left epistles, there are found the characteristics of his own style.[39]

Stylistic Elements

According to Thonssen and Baird, style is related to basic purposes of persuasion. It is a medium through which ideas are made meaningful, and through which a speaker tries to secure a response.[40] Different books give various methods for analyzing style,[41] and list the qualities and criteria considered necessary for effective speech.[42] According to Brigance an effective oral style must include perspicuity, suspense and climax, illustrations, direct address, earnestness, and at times more pronounced rhythm patterns.[43] These characteristics, along with some others, will be discussed in relation to the spoken utterances of Paul and the prophets in their unique speaking situations.

Review of the Literature

Compared to the central influence that the Apostle Paul's speeches exerted in causing the conversion of the Gentiles to Christianity, little scholarly research has been done in connection with his rhetoric. The Table of Contents and Index of Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1915-1969, Speech Monographs, 1934-1969, , The Speech Teacher, 1952-1969, Southern Speech Journal, 1935-1969, Western Speech Journal, 1937-1969, Central States Speech Journal, 1949-1969, and Today's Speech, 1953-1969,[44] revealed nothing written in speech journals concerning Paul's rhetoric. Nor has anything in them been specifically written about it since. The Bibliography of Speech Education[45] listed nothing and the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, in a bibliography on Paul, indicated only three studies written primarily about Paul's preaching.[46] In the Yale Lectures on preaching in 1891, James Stalker gave four lectures on Paul.[47] Caplan and King, in Speech Monographs, listed doctrinal and historical studies in English of preaching from the sixteenth century to 1950. Of those studies that even remotely referred to Paul as a preacher, sixteen books were listed, together with seven magazine or journal articles and three theses.[48]

In 1958, Edward Hunter wrote a Master's thesis in systematic theology on the Apostle Paul as a preacher;[49] Cleary and Hablerman's Bibliography on Rhetoric and Public Address listed a study on the preaching of the Apostle Paul, based especially on First and Second Corinthians. Also listed were a study on the preaching of the primitive church and a study on the effect of classical rhetoric upon Christian preaching, with chief emphasis on the fourth and fifth centuries.[50] None of these studies centered on Paul and his relationship to classical rhetoric. They mainly dealt with theological and evangelistic inquiries, expositions of themes, the influence of principal Church fathers such as St. Cyprian, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine, or arguments for the authenticity of Paul's speeches. However, they did lay a foundation for more exhaustive specific studies of the rhetoric of Paul. Books especially helpful as background material were Paul the Orator by Jones, an argument for the authenticity of the Apostle's speeches in Acts; Early Christian Rhetoric, by Amos Wilder, which discusses particular speech forms that appeared in conjunction with the Gospel;

and Early Christianity and Greek Padeia by Werner Jaeger, which explains the Hellenization of the Christian religion and Christianization of the Greek-speaking world within the Roman Empire. Stylistic considerations in the writings of Amos, Hosea, and Micah, are touched upon by W. E. Orchard in Oracles of God, W. R. Harper in the International Critical Commentary, by R. E. Wolfe in Men of Prophetic Fire, and in Wolfe's Meet Amos and Hosea, the Prophets of Israel. However, these considerations are largely incidental to other purposes.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized so that the next chapter gives some background of the world and mind of the Apostle Paul. Following this overview, six chapters provide a detailed examination of three of Paul's sermons, and the rhetoric of three prophets: Amos, Hosea, and Micah, respectively. Paul's sermon in Acts 13 is discussed in Chapter III; his sermon in Acts 17 is discussed in Chapter V, and his sermon in Acts 20 is discussed in Chapter VII. The rhetoric of Amos is examined in Chapter IV, the rhetoric of Hosea in Chapter VI, and the rhetoric of Micah in Chapter VIII. Each of these chapters is developed in approximately the same way. First, the historical setting of the message is described; then the content of the message is investigated. Finally, a rhetorical analysis of the Biblical record is given, including the response of the audience. The Ninth and concluding chapter collates the results of the previous eight and suggests how the arguments and appeals found in Paul's sermons compare to the arguments and appeals found in the sermons of the three Old Testament minor prophets. Does Paul add new elements to the Hebrew prophetic tradition which exemplify the precepts of classical rhetoric and demonstrate a knowledge of its canons? The investigation concludes with implications of the study and suggestions for further work.

Method of the Study

The method of this investigation, then, is that of rhetorical analysis, comparing the discourses of three Old Testament prophets steeped in the eloquence of the Law, as was Paul, with the strategy of three of Paul's own speeches.

The prophets Amos, Hosea, and Micah were chosen because their prophetic literature is regarded as representative of the period of 760 to 460 B.C.--a period Biblical scholars refer to as the Golden Age of Hebrew rhetoric. Amos is dated about 760 B.C., and Hosea and Micah about 750 B.C. and 722 B.C., respectively.[51] As a means of attaining a perspective for their work, so that the analyses will be more meaningful, an attempt will be made to view the prophets through the eyes of the eighth century B.C. When an orator speaks, there is an interaction of the speaker, the speech, the audience, and the setting. The persuasive style is determined by these elements.[52] Therefore, the available information regarding each of these variable factors has a bearing upon the speaking of the prophets. The background of the prophet sometimes is reflected in his speeches. The books of the prophets give few indications regarding the exact speeches. The audience is seldom identified, but the setting is known to be the eighth century B.C. in Israel. There is, of course, some disagreement about the prophets among scholars, but there is, nevertheless, a core of agreement which will be indicated in each chapter.

These prophetic materials were spoken before they were written and even today suggest an oral quality in our Biblical translations. They may be studied profitably in spite of the difficulties faced in ascertaining possible changes in terminology which have developed in their transmission through the centuries, and as a result of the obvious hazards wrought by translations. It is still possible to study these works in their present form to discover stylistic characteristics and the effect of language choices in evoking appeals to the audience. The King James version of the Bible constitutes the primary source for this study because it is almost universally accepted and in poetry its rhythm is more nearly like the Hebrew.[53]

Each of Paul's three sermons chosen for consideration was addressed to a vastly different audience. The missionary sermon in Acts 13 took place before an eager audience of Jews and uneducated heathen, in a Jewish synagogue of

Pisidian Antioch. Antioch, third largest city of the Roman Empire and the "gateway to the East," was where Paul's special apostolate to the Gentiles began to take a definite shape. It was here that the baptized were first called Christians. The address in Acts 17 was delivered as an evangelistic message to the cultured, educated, but idolatrous Greeks of Athens. The message in Acts 20 was given as a fatherly charge and farewell to a loving group of Christian believers from Ephesus. Each of these sermons, therefore, represents a different set of communicative conditions, to serve admirably as a basis for establishing Pauline rhetorical speech patterns.

Whenever the prophets or Paul preached, their purpose was to persuade men to action. Their methods of doing so are demonstrated through a review of their preaching and are reinforced by references to classical and contemporary works in communication.

In order to make a comparison between Paul's rhetoric and that of the three prophets, distinct elements were examined in the rhetoric of each. These elements were: The response of the audience to the sermon; the appropriateness of the theme to the occasion and audience, the structure of the sermon, analysis of style and delivery, including the speaker's use of propriety, correctness, perspicuity and ornamentation, and his employment of pathos and ethos. The speaker's adaptation to the audience is noted throughout the analysis.

The Nature of Rhetorical Analysis

Since the method of approach in this study was that of a "rhetorical analysis," the nature of such analysis requires a brief explanation.

When Bishop Whately published his Elements of Rhetoric, he confessed in his preface that he had hesitated to use the word "rhetoric" in his title, because, he said, it is "apt to suggest to many minds an associated idea of empty declamation, or of dishonest artifice; or a mere dissertation on tropes and Figures of Speech."[54] Unfortunately, it is true that "rhetoric" is a word which has lost most of its good connotation, being most widely known by its bad ones. The dictionary gives several negative meanings for the word: "artificial elegance of language; discourse without conviction, or earnest feelings; inflated language, verbosity, bombast."[55] For this reason it is not unusual to hear certain speeches described as "mere rhetoric," or certain speakers accused of indulging in meaningless displays of "rhetoric." The term, so used, suggests high-sounding words without content, inflation of language to cover weakness of thought, or, worse of all, oratorical falsification to hide true intention.

Yet, in its original and nobler meaning, "rhetoric" was simply defined as "the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever."[56]

It is in this latter and more positive sense that the term is currently used in the field of communication. Bryant defines "rhetoric" as "the rationale of informative and suasory discourse, a body of principle and precept for the creation and analysis of speeches."[57] Taylor calls it "the discovery and use of correct methods, with the audience always at the center of attention."[58] And Kenneth Burke asserts, "rhetoric is the art of persuasion, or a study of the means of persuasion available for any given situation."[59]

In the schools of Greece and Rome, between the third century B.C., and the second century A.D., which includes Paul's lifetime, rhetoric was the most important art to be studied. It was held to be the most valued part of education, more significant even than grammar and logic, the two other components of the trivium. At about age fourteen, a boy was sent to a school of rhetoric to engage in theory and the practice of public speaking.[60] Such instruction might continue throughout his lifetime.

Rhetorical works between the fifth century B.C., and the fourth century A.D., tended to treat two basic questions: How to decide what was to be said in a given case and how to adapt this subject matter to the needs and demands of the audience.[61] Speeches which sought to persuade were usually organized according to the five Hellenic canons: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. The successful orator also used ethos and pathos, as well as logos. These theories were taught in the schools of Tarsus and will be discussed further in the second chapter.

It is with this early and technical meaning, therefore, that the term "rhetoric" is used in this paper. Since the intention of this study was to analyze Paul's sermons and the messages of Amos, Hosea, and Micah, the main consideration is their ability as communicators: their method of influencing their audience. A rhetorical analysis looks beyond the content of the sermons and seeks to determine what the speaker did to successfully impart his ideas to his hearers. Edwin Black ably distinguishes and defines the unique goal of a rhetorical analysis:

> Discourses can be culled for many purposes other than understanding how they work, which is the task of criticism. The political reporter may examine the deliberative address for indications of future policy; the biographer may look for clues to cast of mind and inner life; the poetaster may read the oration for its passages of fire; the pilgrim may search the sermon for a faith. These are legitimate preoccupations and there are more like them; but they are not criticism. Criticism has no relationship with its subject other than to account for how that subject works.[62]

Obviously an author's intent and content must first be clearly understood, but the ultimate aim of criticism is strictly pragmatic.

> Since speaking is a communicative venture and since a speaker seeks to communicate a particular set of ideas and feelings to a specific audience, it must follow that the rhetorical critic is concerned with the method employed by a speaker to achieve the response consistent with his purpose.[63]

Rhetorical criticism is concerned, then, not with beauty or permanence, but with effect. "It regards a speech as a communication to a specific audience and holds its business to be the analysis and appreciation of the orator's method of imparting his ideas to his hearers."[64]

Form and content are not entirely separable. Aristotle, in his Rhetoric, treats form as a vehicle for content, a means for persuasively communicating content. Persuasion was the important aim of the prophets and of Paul. A study of their rhetorical form and content is therefore meaningful. Rhetorical forms are governed by a world-view and by their character as a response to contemporary social conditions. What the prophet says also speaks in and through his form. The speeches of the prophets and of Saint Paul were not art objects, then, but language events.[65] The primary question to be asked regarding them is, "What strategies or techniques of rhetoric did the prophets and Paul use to achieve response?"

Logos and Mythos--the Ancient Dispute

The dispute as to whether or not Paul used the rhetorical forms of Greek culture and whether he should have, or appropriately could use them, reflects the question as to whether intellectualism and mysticism are mutually exclusive.[66] The ancient dispute between rhetoric and poetic, between logos[67] and mythos, is specifically pertinent to this study. The mystical theory, with its stress on God's doing the important part of the work in the organization and presentation of a message, appears to conflict with the traditional rhetorical theory of Aristotle which stipulates conscious study and the organization and systematic development of arguments. In fact, to many of the mystics of ancient times, to follow Aristotle or to handle pagan books at all was impious. This belief had an effect on the use of classical rhetorical works, and is still present in religious circles today where mysticism and rhetoric, mythos and logos, are considered to be mutually exclusive. Arguments urging the incompatibility between rhetoric and mysticism would seem to lead to agreement with the declaration of Gregory Nyssa that Paul surely deemed it a shame to use the Greek world's formal rhetoric rather than the truth alone to present the counsels of God. However, an analysis of Saint Paul's speeches, together with those of three minor Hebrew prophets, should elucidate and support Gregory of Nyssa's declaration, or else give evidence to refute it.

FOOTNOTES

[1] William Cleaver Wilkinson, "Paul," in *Modern Masters of Pulpit Discourse* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1905), p. 485.

[2] Joel Swartz, "The Eloquence of St. Paul," *The Quarterly Review*, New Series, 2 (July, 1872), 432.

[3] Walter A. Jennrich, "Classical Rhetoric in the New Testament," *The Classical Journal*, 44, No. 1 (October, 1948), 30-31.

[4] Ibid., p. 31.

[5] Eduard Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa II* (Leipzig, 1898), p. 493.

[6] W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life, Times, and Travels of St. Paul* (Philadelphia: A. H. Hubbard, 1869), p. 33.

[7] Daniel-Rops, *Saint Paul, Apostle of Nations*, trans. Jex Martin (Paris: Fayard, 1952), p. 15.

Samuel Sandmel, *The Genius of Paul, a Study in History* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1958), pp. 8-10.

Giuseppe Ricciotti, *Paul the Apostle*, trans. Alba Zizzamia (Wisconsin: Bruce Publishing Company, 1953), p. 41.

See also Acts 9:11, 9:30, 11:25, and Acts 21:39 and 22:3: Paul's own testimony as to his birthplace. A reference in Galatians 1:17, indicates that Paul commenced his ministry in Damascus, after his conversion on the road to that city, and after his return from Arabia, before he went to Jerusalem. Some scholars believe the reference indicates Damascus as Paul's birthplace.

[8] Strabo, *Geography: "Books VIII-IX."* With an English translation by Horace Leonard Jones. Vol. IV in the Loeb Classical Library, 8 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. v, 465.

[9] David Smith, *The Life and Letters of St. Paul* (New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.), p. 18.

[10] Lewis Havernok, Saul of Tarsus (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960), p. 12.

[11] W. M. Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1908), pp. 86-89.

[12] Martin Dibelius, Paul, trans. Frank Clarke (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), p. 21.

[13] Donald Lemen Clark, Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), pp. 60-61.

[14] The Aramaic vernacular would be the language of Paul's home and he spoke it as freely as a native of Palestine; he would also learn the ancient Hebrew, the original language of the Sacred Scriptures. But Greek was the language of a Hellenistic community and it was the Septuagint version of the Scriptures that would be studied in such synagogues as in Tarsus. David Smith, p. 22.

[15] Richard B. Jones, Saul of Tarsus (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1933), pp. vii, viii.

[16] Duncan Black MacDonald, The Hebrew Literary Genius (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1933), pp. 303-304.

[17] P. A. Woffron, Who Was Saul of Tarsus? (New York: E. B. Treat & Company, 1958), p. 17.

[18] Galatians 1:15, 16.

[19] Acts 17:29; I Corinthians 1:12; Titus 1:12; also Romans 1 & 2.

[20] Giuseppe Ricciotti, p. 53.

[21] Howard Tillman Kuist, The Pedagogy of St. Paul (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1925), p. xiii.

[22] Romans 11:32.

[23] Gerald M. Phillips, "The Practice of Rhetoric at Talmudic Academies," Speech Monographs, 26 (March, 1959), 37-46.

[24] Conybeare and Howson, pp. 42-43.

Paul's trade of tentmaking does not indicate his financial or social situation, for the Jewish Law prescribed the instruction of every male child in some handicraft. The extensive travel, especially by sea, made by Paul on his tours whenever and wherever he desired, indicates there was a considerable amount of money at his disposal. (Acts 16:7-

12; 18:18-23; 20:1-3; 21:1-8). Of course, some of Paul's money came from certain churches, but there seems to be evidence that he had income in addition to this support. To reside for a long time in Ephesus meant considerable expense (Acts 19:8-12). During his residence there he made intimate acquaintance with some of the "chiefs of Asia" (Acts 19:31). When he was imprisoned at Caesarea, Felix expected him to offer a bribe (Acts 24:26); and in Rome, where cost of living was high, Paul lived in his own hired house--a house large enough to contain a large audience (Acts 28:23). Finally, Paul's heritage was of the important Pharisaic sect.

[25] E.g., Romans 9:17; 11:4; 12:19; I Corinthians 3:19. "Review for Religions," The Religious Review, 8 (July, 1949), 49.

[26] James Iverach, St. Paul, His Life and Times (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., n.d.), pp. 4, 5.

[27] Sydney Cave, The Gospel of St. Paul, A Reinterpretation in the Light of the Religion of His Age and Modern Missionary Experience (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928), p. 63.

[28] Dibelius, p. 15.

[29] "We are likely to picture him speaking with many nervous gestures, in emotionally charged tones, with eyes burning, with face mobile and aglow--himself completely dominated by the thing he is saying and become a completely surrendered medium for the communication of it to others." John Knox, Chapters in the Life of Paul (Nashville: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1950), p. 93.

[30] Maurice Jones, St. Paul the Orator: A Critical Historical, and Explanatory Commentary on the Speeches of St. Paul (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910), pp. 1, 2.

[31] Cave, p. 63.

[32] A. T. Robertson, Luke the Historian in the Light of Research (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), p. 227.

[33] Henry J. Cadbury, "The Speeches in Acts," in Additional Notes to the Commentary, ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, Vol. V of The Beginnings of Christianity; Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (5 vols.; London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1920-1938), p. 407.

[34] J. W. McGarvey, *New Commentary on Acts of Apostles* (2 vols.; Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1892), I, xiii.

[35] Cf. also Martin Dibelius, *The Message of Jesus Christ: the Tradition of the Early Christian Communities*, trans. by Frederick D. Grant (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939), pp. 130-131; and Richard Belward Rackham, "The Acts of the Apostles; an Exposition," in *Westminster Commentaries*, ed. by Walter Lock and D. C. Simpson (14th ed.; London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1951), p. xliv.

For "imaginative reconstructions" and "expanded versions" of certain of these sermons, see the Appendix of J. B. Phillips, *The Young Church in Action, a Translation of the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956), pp. 81-103.

[36] W. J. Conybeare and J. W. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (2 vols.; unabridged ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.), I, 174. Italics theirs.

[37] F. F. Bruce, *The Books and the Parchments* (London: Pickering and Inglis, Ltd., 1953), p. 171.

[38] Sir Frederick Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948), p. 23.

[39] McGarvey, pp. xii-xiv.

[40] Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, *Speech Criticism* (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1948), pp. 429-30.

[41] For example: R. T. Moffett and W. H. Johnson, *Basic Writing* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937), pp. 62-86 lists variety and emphasis.

[42] For example: Andrew T. Weaver, *Speech, Forms and Principles* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1951), pp. 285-288 lists accuracy, force, suggestiveness, and ease.

[43] W. N. Brigance, *The Spoken Word, A Textbook of Speech Compositions* (New York: F. S. Crofts and Co., 1927), pp. 189-91.

[44] Ronald J. Matlon and Irene R. Matlon, eds (N. Y.: Published by Speech Communication Association, 1971).

[45] Lester Thonssen, Elizabeth Fatherson, and Dorothea Thonssen, ed., *Bibliography of Speech Education* (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1950).

[46] *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, ed. James Orr (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Co., 1947), IV, p. 2288. The three studies mentioned were done in 1859, 1910, and 1911.

[47] James Stalker, *The Preacher and His Models* (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1891), p. 153.

[48] Harry Caplan and Henry H. King, "Pulpit Eloquence, A List of Doctrinal and Historical Studies in English," *Speech Monographs*, XXII (Special Issue) (1955). The pertinent studies are as follows: p. 18, James, Richard (1592-1638). P. *History of preaching; or, concerning the Apostles' preaching and ours; a sermon on I Cor. 9:16*. London 1630; p. 20, Predeaux, John, bp. of Worcester (1578-1650). P. *Sacred eloquence, or the art of rhetoric, as it is laid down in the Scripture*. London 1659; p. 24, Appleton, Nathaniel (1693-1784). P. *The great apostle Paul exhibited and recommended as a pattern of true Gospel preaching*. Boston 1761; p. 26, Cooke, Samuel (1708-1783). P. *The charge of St. Paul to the elders of the church of Ephesus*. Boston 1759; p. 28, Fletcher (Flechere), John William (1729-1785). P. *The Portrait of St. Paul; or the true model for Christians and ministers*. New York 1804, 1834; London 1807 (tr. from a French MS. of the late Rev. John William de La Flechiere by Joshua Gilpin); p. 32-33, Packard, Hezekiah (1761-1849). P. *The Rational method of preaching exemplified by the great Apostle to the gentiles is evangelical, and recommended to Christian ministers of every denomination*. Newburyport 1797; p. 33, Parsons, Moses (1716-1783). P. *The character of able ministers of the New Testament described*. . . . Salem 1775; p. 35, Thayer, Nathaniel (1769-1840). P. *The preaching and practice of the apostles recommended as a model for the ministers of Christ*. . . . Portland (Maine) 1799; p. 50, Dealtry, William (1775-1847). P. *The nature and tendency of apostolical preaching considered: a sermon preached in the parish church of St. Michael*, Bath, . . . June 8, 1817. London 1817; p. 57, Eadie, John (1810-1876). P. *Paul the preacher*. London 1859; p. 59, Fiske, Thaddeus (1762-1855). P. *The life and character of St. Paul, a model for Christian ministers*. . . . Boston 1843; p. 71, Mason, John Mitchell (1770-1829). p. 1. *The evangelical ministry exemplified in the Apostle Paul*. . . . New York 1822; p. 80, Sawyer, A. W. P. "Apostolic preaching," Philadelphia 1872 (*Baptist quarterly* 6 469 ff.); p. 85, Sumner, John Bird, abp. of Cantebury (1780-1862). P. *Apostolical Preaching considered in an examination of St. Paul's Epistles*. London 1815; o. 101, Bodker, Robert C. P. "St. Paul's grand affirmations; a plea for conviction in preaching." New York 1932 (*Homiletic review* 103. 27-29); p. 106, Chadwick, William Edward (1858-1934). P. *The pastoral teaching of St. Paul: his ministerial ideals*. Edinburgh 1907; p. 108,

Cook, Charles Augustus. P. *Apostolic preaching*. Philadelphia (U.S.,Cat., 1912); p. 112, Dodd, Charles Harold (b. 1884). P. *Apostolic preaching and its developments; three lectures*. London 1936; p. 123, Howard, Martha Moffett. *A Study of public speaking in the first century A.D. as revealed in the Acts of the Apostles*. Iowa City 1950 (M. A. thesis, State University of Iowa, typewritten); p. 127, Kauffman, Daniel, bp. (1865-1944). P. "Paul's preaching points." *Mennonite cyclopedia dictionary* 1925. 18. 196; p. 130, Law, Robert (1860-1919). P. "St. Paul on preaching." New York 1917 *Constructive quarterly* 5. 552-567; p. 142, Phelps, William Lyon (1865-1943). P. "Out of Antioch; Paul and Barnabas borne on a tide of Christianity that has never been checked." Philadelphia, Sept. 1924 (*Ladies home journal* 41. 20, 116, 119, 121); p. 145, Richards, Clara. *Elements of persuasion used by St. Paul, based on the King James translation of the Bible*. Salt Lake City 1940 (M. A. thesis, University of Utah, typewritten; p. 146, Sanders, Charles Finley (b. 1869). P. "Paul's conception of preaching." Gettysburgh 1904 (*Lutheran quarterly* 34. 260 ff.); p. 150, Sockman, R. W. (b. 1889). P. "Preaching values in the New Testament," by H. E. Luccock (review). New York 1928 (*Methodist review* 111. 785); p. 150, Spangler, J. T. (b. 1867). P. "The New Testament conception of preaching." Dallas (Texas) 1934 (*Bibliotheca sacra* 91. 442-47).

[49] Edward Gordon Hunter, "The Apostle Paul as a Preacher," Unpublished S.T.M. thesis, Temple University School of Theology, 1958, pp. v-98.

[50] Charles Abiel Chamberlin, "The Preaching of the Apostle Paul, Based on a Study of the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's Letters, with Special Reference to First and Second Corinthians." Unpublished S.T.D. dissertation, Temple University School of Theology, 1959.

Millard Griffin Foote, "The Preaching of the Primitive Church," Unpublished S.T.M. thesis, Andover-Newton School of Theology, 1938.

Benignus Cloonan, "The Effect of Classical Rhetoric upon Christian Preaching during the First Five Centuries A.D." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1959.

[51] E. Konig, "Prophecy (Hebrew)," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings, Vol. 10 (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1918), p. 388.

[52] Thonssen and Baird, p. 430.

[53] William A. Faus, *The Genius of the Prophets* (New York: Abingdon, Cokesbury Press, 1946), p. 7.

[54] Richard Whately, *Elements of Rhetoric: Comprising: An Analysis of the Laws of Moral Evidence and of Persuasion, with Rules for Argumentative Composition and Elocution* (New ed., revised by the author; New York: Sheldon & Company, Publishers, 1869), p. 3.

[55] *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language*, Unabridged, ed. by Philip Babcock Gove (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company, Publishers, 1967), p. 1946.

[56] Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric, with an English translation* by John Henry Freese. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), i.2. 1.

[57] Donald C. Bryant, "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Scope," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 39 (December, 1953) p. 408.

[58] Vernon L. Taylor, "The Classical Approach to Homiletics," *The Pulpit*, 32 (September, 1961), p. 24.

[59] Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 46.

[60] Clark, pp. 60-62.

[61] Albert J. Croft, "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 42 (October, 1956), p. 286.

[61] Edwin Black, *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965), p. 18.

[62] Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, *Speech Criticism: The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1952), p. 9.

[63] Herbert A. Wilchens, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans* (New York: The Century Co., 1925), p. 209.

[64] Amos N. Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 4, 26, 27.

[65] In this case the writer is using Dr. Trent's definition of Intellectualism as a "consistent, creative devotion to understanding and appreciation of a wide variety of ideas." James W. Trent and Jenette Golds, "Religious Commitment and the Intellectual Life," *Catholics in College* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 6.

[67] logos: Philosophy; mind or reason as a universal principle; spoken word or discourse; active principles of reason, or select words.

(Descartes): "All words lead to THE Word:"--Jesus, the Logos, the Word of God Himself (I John 1:1) who is also the Thought, Concept, and Idea behind THE WORD. In this study, the first meanings listed: philosophy-mind-reason-spoken discourse-select words, is what is meant by "logos"; Logos with a capital L refers to Jesus, the living Word of God.

CHAPTER II

THE WORLD OF PAUL

In order to fully understand the character of the audiences before whom Paul spoke, it is necessary to be aware of the historical setting in which his hearers lived. This grasp of the circumstances and conditions in Paul's world will, in turn, shed light on the manner and content of his messages, and the reasons and purposes that governed them. Furthermore, in order to fully comprehend and appreciate the speeches and the speaker, it is also necessary to understand the personal influences and experiences which caused Paul, himself, to live, think, and speak as he did. The historical setting, then, and the mind of Paul, will be the subjects of discussion in this chapter on Paul's world.

The Historical Setting

Introduction

The world of Paul was the Roman empire which encompassed points from Jerusalem in southern Syria to inland and coastal centers of Asia Minor and Greece, as well as many island cities in the Mediterranean, and the city of Rome itself. The Roman culture was essentially Greek, for the

Latin conquerors had inherited Hellenic and Hellenistic thought, with many of the ideals of Classicism. Humanism, the chief characteristic of Classicism, had been brought forth by Greek genius and democracy which stressed the responsibility of every free man to participate in city life and to contribute his best to civic activity. Reason was one of the distinguishing Greek ideals, in spite of the unreasonable disunity and rivalry of Greek cities that caused deterioration of Greek democracy and the Pelopponnesian wars. Isocrates incorporated Reason along with other such ideals as Creativity and Insight into an educational system that trained many of the greatest thinkers for two thousand years. When Alexander, who was reared under Greek rhetoric and epics, conquered the world, he took with him an admiration for Hellenism, and gave impetus to the expansion of Greek influence. However, his death was followed by constant strife, and in 146 B.C., his huge empire came under the supreme power of Rome.

Cicero (106-43 B.C.), the great Latin orator and the Latin world's teacher in philosophy, believed in the classical virtues and "was the medium for the propagation of those ideas which informed the law and institutions of the empire."[1] He advocated a higher law and a moral life, and by his own love of goodness and the beautiful, which shone in spite of his weaknesses, he set conscience and personal ideals and efforts on the throne. "It was through Cicero that Greek thought reached the world."[2] In proclaiming the ideal of excellence, Cicero insisted upon man's capacity "to realize that ideal through a self-imposed discipline in which the passions are subjected to the control of reason."[3] He was, according to Warde Fowler, "the most highly cultivated man of antiquity,"[4] and he expressed the two Hellenic types of human excellence: the hero and the citizen. He brought to Rome the ideals and sense of mission which caused her rulers to seek an empire of peace and justice. His concepts of the qualities and functions of the ideal orator will be referred to frequently in succeeding chapters.

The Political Setting
40 B.C.- A.D. 96

When Octavius, who took the name Augustus, became first emperor of Rome in 27 B.C., he ruled between eighty and one hundred twenty million people, the population varying greatly from time to time, depending on the size of the empire.[5] It was the influence of religious concepts and a borrowed Greek culture which stabilized the vast empire, and the reign of Augustus marked the beginning of the Pax Romana (Roman Peace) which lasted 200 years.

The Romans were great statesmen; they were the first to impose central authority upon a large area while at the same time preserving local government. However, supreme authority rested with the emperor, who was chosen by his predecessor, or the army. The Roman Senate, which at first had the right to advise the emperor, went through the motions of electing him, and thus preserved the titles and forms of a republic. But it was not very long before the Senate lost its chief powers and the Roman government became an absolute monarchy.

In 40 B.C., the Roman Senate had appointed Herod king of Palestine, but the Jews resisted desperately and it took Herod three years to capture their Holy City. He was the first foreigner to rule directly over the Jewish people. In an effort to win his subjects, he began rebuilding their Temple in 18 B.C., and completed it in A.D. 65, only five years before its final destruction. Nevertheless, he was bitterly hated for his cruelty and irreverance. One of his irritating actions was to place a large golden eagle, the emblem of Roman power, over the principal gate of the Temple. This naturally enraged the Jews. At the instigation of two rabbis, some young men removed it, and were repaid for their efforts by being burned alive.[6] Though Herod was a wicked man, he was a highly talented and successful ruler, and, therefore, was called "the Great." When he died, he left in his will instructions to divide Palestine among three of his sons. Archelaus was to be tetrarch of Judea and Samaria. Herod Antipas was to be tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, and Philip tetrarch of Iturea.[7] A tetrarch was a tributary prince inferior to a king. In A.D. 6, Archelaus was accused by the Jews of cruelty, and deposed by Augustus.

Henceforth, Judea and Samaria were ruled by a Roman procurator who stood under the Roman legatus of the imperial province of Syria. The fifth man to hold this office was Pontius Pilate, A.D. 26-A.D. 36, who ordered Jesus to be crucified. It is generally believed that Pilate sent the reigning emperor, Tiberius, a report of the trial. Tiberius, who succeeded Augustus, was at first an able ruler, but as time went on he had become more and more a cruel and revengeful tyrant. In A.D. 37, the Roman emperor Caligula (A.D. 37-A.D. 44), who succeeded Tiberius, gave to a grandson of Herod the Great, Agrippa I (A.D. 37-A.D. 44) the title "king" and the tetrarchy of the deceased Philip. In A. D. 39, after Herod Antipas was banished, Caligula added to Agrippa's tetrarchy both Galilee and Perea. When the insane Caligula was murdered, he was succeeded by Claudius. In A.D. 41, Claudius gave Agrippa I both Judea and Samaria, so that all Palestine became united once more under an Herodian prince.

In order to please the Jews, King Agrippa persecuted the Christians, killing James and imprisoning Peter.[8] When Agrippa died, Claudius annexed all Palestine to Syria and had it again governed by procurators, two of whom were Felix and Festus, before whom the Apostle Paul offered his defense.[9] An excellent ruler, Claudius established a civil service system and granted citizenship to certain persons in Rome's provinces; later it was he who drove the Jews out of

Rome because of their incessant controversies in the synagogues over the Messiah. In A.D. 53, Claudius gave Agrippa II a part of Philip's tetrarchy and the title "king," and later also gave him parts of Galilee and Perea. Over this territory Agrippa II reigned from A.D. 53 to A.D. 101. Paul was called upon to give his defense and witness before this man, also.

Claudius, who was lame and a stutterer, spent much time studying and writing histories in his youth, and as Emperor, built aqueducts, drained marshes, made a harbor at Ostia, and conquered parts of England and the Balkan Peninsula. He married several times and when he married his niece, Agrippina the Younger, he adopted her son, Nero. Some historians believe Agrippina murdered Claudius so that Nero could become emperor. Claudius died of poisoning in A.D. 54.

If Agrippina thought she would reign through her son, she was soon disappointed. Nero was not fond of being dominated and had her murdered, as well as having his wife killed, his brother, and his teacher, Seneca. In A.D. 64, Nero set fire to Rome and put the blame on the Christians. This charge led to persecution of the Christians in A.D. 64-A.D. 67, and it is during this time that Peter is believed to have been crucified upside down and Paul beheaded. When a revolution in the armies of Gaul, Spain, and Germany broke out against Nero, he committed suicide, insanely crying, "What a great artist dies with me!"[10] Three emperors followed him in the next year, succeeded by Vespasian in A.D. 69-A.D. 79. Vespasian is known as the General of the war against the Jews, though it was his son, Titus, who completely captured Jerusalem and destroyed the Temple in A.D. 70. As Emperor, following his father in A.D. 79, Titus was generous and concerned for the welfare of his people, and won most hearts with his justice and humanity. He was a sharp contrast to his brother, Domitian, A.D. 81- A.D. 86, who ruled absolutely as a terrible tyrant. People of other religions such as Jews and Christians were executed during his reign. He banished the Apostle John to Patmos and required the relatives of Christ to appear before him because he was afraid they might revive the claims of Jesus to the throne.[11] With his wife's help, he was assassinated.

The Social Setting

Roman cruelty and greed caused great misery during the lifetime of Paul, and the use of force brought hardship and death. Still, the Greco-Roman ideals of duty and purpose clung, along with a sense of personal worth, and the Jews, under their high priests and Sanhedrin, enjoyed a large measure of home rule.

The Jewish nation was divided into two sections: the Jews in Palestine, and the Jews of the Dispersion. Jews of the Dispersion were more numerous, and were found in all countries. There were four sections of the Dispersion: the original Dispersion in Babylon, then in Syria and Asia Minor

(Antioch and Cilicia), in Egypt (Alexandria), and in the West (Rome).[12] In the New Testament the Jews are known by three names: "Jew," denoting the nationality in opposition to "Greek" or "Gentile"; "Hebrew," a Jew in respect to his language and education, in opposition to a Hellenist--a Jew speaking Greek; and "Israelite," a Jew in respect to his religious privileges. The Jews in Palestine and the East were called "Hebrews" because they used the Aramaic language; the rest were called "Hellenists" or "Grecians" because they used the Greek language.[13] Four languages were used: (1) Old Hebrew, lost in Babylon, was still read in Christ's time in the synagogue, yet was not well understood and therefore needed interpretation through the Aramaic paraphrases (Targums). After the return from Babylon, Old Hebrew became the language of worship and revelation, kept for holy uses. (2) Aramaic, cognate to Hebrew and therefore easily adopted by the Jews in Babylon, was kept after their return to Palestine.[14] Aramaic was the language of the Jews in Christ's time, and was no doubt the language Jesus used.[15] (3) Greek, the language of polite literature in all countries, but strongly opposed by the Pharisees, was employed by the Jews of the Dispersion, and used in the courts of Herod and Pilate.[16] (4) Latin, the official language of the Roman government, was not used by the Jews and not generally understood by them. No doubt by divine guidance it was thought necessary to write the inscription over the cross in three of the languages: Greek, Latin, and Aramaic,[17] that all men might read and understand.

The Jews possessed, as the Talmud and the Old Testament reveal, a great mass of valid technical and general knowledge, but they lacked the power of logical abstraction. They could not frame definitions of objects, but only gave descriptions; by law they meant merely the precepts of a ruler. Consequently they had no real science and philosophy, and very little art. The Jews opposed the spread of Greek culture; yet they, and especially the Hellenists, were powerfully influenced by the general world-culture, as is shown in their literature. Their writers were greatly aided by the translation of the Old Testament into Greek, the Septuagint (LXX). Josephus (A.D. 37-A.D. 103), a Jewish priest who was first a general of the Jewish rebels in Galilee, and later a protegé of Titus, wrote in Greek and Aramaic such works as Antiquities, the History of the Jews; Jewish War; Against Apion; and An Autobiography.

Paul's world was the "Golden Age" of Roman Literature, made illustrious by a large group of writers in prose and poetry, and by splendor and activity in art. Caesar Augustus built twelve temples, repaired eighty-two more, completed the large Basilica Julia, and constructed a mausoleum for himself. According to tradition he boasted, "I have found Rome of brick and left it of marble." In Roman art, Roman artists made beautiful portrait busts, and they introduced the use of concrete. The arch was developed into the dome, as employed in the Pantheon. Greek art, especially the Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian style of architecture was introduced. The sciences did not interest the Romans, although they made use of Greek knowledge. In literature, Virgil wrote the Aeneid, and Horace created the model of lyric poetry. His odes, satires, and epistles are models of wisdom. Letter writing and satire originated as literary forms in Roman times. Ovid wrote Metamorphoses during this age. Sallus and Livy, the greatest of Roman historians, Cicero, the great Roman orator, and the three great Roman philosophers: Seneca, Cicero, and Epictetus, made the age what it was. Nevertheless, even in Rome itself, it was the Greek language which was used as a literary medium and sign of higher culture.

The extension of Hellenic culture was one of the gifts of Roman rule. In the Empire, the thought and aspirations of Classicism which associated the notion of power with service, formed the basis for the good life. Thus, Greek art, literature and philosophy ruled the world in which Paul lived, as they still do ours to a large extent. Of their great influence the New Testament is witness.

The Greeks were proud of their accomplishments and ancestry. Their language and learning in each center was strengthened frequently by members fresh from the several universities. Rome, because of her imperial policy, had no time to educate the youth, so those who could read and write persisted in the use of the Greek language. Hellenic civilization had formed a system of public education in an unsurpassed and almost unequalled way.

Roman road building connected inland routes well, and land travel was popular, not only by walking but by caravans or hired carriages. Besides building roads, the Romans built aqueducts and bridges so skillfully that many are still in use 2,000 years after they were constructed. Travel was often slow because of complications: Complications such as difficulties in obtaining travel permits, negotiating mountain passes, and in collecting taxes. Oppression by tax collectors increased, robbing the vitality of provincial workers. Sea travel, while still uncertain, was common. The galleys furnished the power, and in stormy seasons, they traveled as close to the coast as possible. During danger seasons, due to climatic conditions, only cargo ships attempted travel. Thus, people were often delayed in getting passage, and inconvenienced for long and unexpected periods of time.

The people were heterogeneous in each center of the Empire, except possibly in the lumber center of Lystra and the strictly Macedonian Beroea. The population differed in learning, customs, beliefs, and racial traits. Even within one race there was a great difference. For example, the nonintellectual Jews differed from the Jews educated in Greek universities. The uneducated group were easily roused to mob action and worked against any advancement. The two classes were found in all communities but were more noticeable in Jerusalem. The family life of the Jews was strict in firmly rooting within the children their national and religious life. Characters were built according to patterns slavishly following traditional laws, in contrast to the Greeks' widespread freedom of learning.

The moral degradation of Paul's world may be judged by his lurid picture of pagan wickedness in Romans 1:18-32. His judgment should not be deemed as from too high a moral standard, though, since all that he says is confirmed by pagan authors. The excavated objects of Pompeii, buried during the reign of Titus, give us glimpses of the horrible nature of vice and crime in this period. Most of the emperors themselves were a terrible result of heathenism. Labor was generally considered a disgrace, and the middle class disappeared. Among the 1,200,000 inhabitants of Rome at Christ's time, there were scarcely 2,000 proprietors, but the number of slaves was 1,300,000 in Italy, and 6,000,000 in the whole Empire. Slaves were harshly treated. For example, a law was advocated that when a master was murdered, all of his slaves should be considered under suspicion and promptly crucified.[18] The slave system brought deterioration of morals and stagnation of technological improvements. Material wealth was admired and sought after beyond spiritual riches, and Epicureanism helped corrupt men's minds and spirits. Among the rich there arose the disgusting habit of preparing for dinner by taking an emetic. Enormous wealth and coarse luxury created a sense of insecurity and terror for all those outside of it.

As women demanded more liberties and economic independence, distinctions between the married and unmarried were erased, and not only prostitution but homosexuality was viewed casually. Little distinction was made between a wife and a concubine, and whereas family life among the Romans was once a sacred thing, under the Roman Empire marriage was regarded with disfavor. Women, it seemed, married in order to be divorced, and were divorced in order to marry. Children were not wanted and abortion was common. Since morals were no longer linked with political life, immorality became more and more common among the rich as well as the poor, and among men and women of distinction. The Greek gods did not help improve the situation, for Plato rightfully complained of their immorality and its effect upon the people. Even the rites of religion were used to satisfy lusts. The right to suicide was honored, and murder was condoned by such means as gladatorial contests, sea games, and infanticide. According to Tacitus, in Rome, to corrupt and to be corrupt was the spirit of the times.[19]

On the other hand, positive characteristics of the Roman empire included peace, (usually) justice, law, and freedom to pursue and circulate ideas, as well as security in travel. Although captive races could no longer shape their national destinies, their peaceful city life and law were encouraged, and this fact was no doubt later responsible for the ability of the early Christian Church to develop missionary centers. Greek cities were enjoying more self-government, but unfortunately often achieved their goals through mob violence. The great influence of the Roman women in their colonies, where the fair sex could convince magistrates of desired changes, did not exist in Greek cities where it was still believed woman's place was under a veil. Nevertheless, a heterogeneous, often aggressive Greek population encouraged freedom of thought and exchange of ideas.

In spite of the cosmopolitan population in each community, outstanding distinctions always occurred between communities, due to different predominant occupations, type of government control, and class of people in greatest favor or majority at a particular time. These distinctions gave an opportunity for the clever orator to be selective in his approach to gain attention, and in his use of subject matter to maintain interest. Paul was not lacking in such ingenuity, for his speeches show wise application to the characteristics of each group he contacts.

The Religious Setting

The Romans, always practical, who provided their city with sewers, whereas the Greeks adorned theirs with statuary,[20] were "practical" in religious matters also. They did not worship in order to be made good, but to be made prosperous. They believed that success or failure in life depended upon faithfulness in religious ritual, and sacrifice was the essence of the rite. Each divinity was thought to abide in a certain place, and only there could he be worshipped. For example, Janus was the spirit of the doorway; Vesta the spirit of the fire on the hearth, etc. There was also a god of gold coins and a goddess of fever.[21] A different god represented every object as well as different events in a person's life. The farmers, or pagani, remained faithful to their farm gods and farm feasts throughout Roman history; they were the last to accept Christianity. Because of this, non-Christians were called pagans.[22] The true Roman gods had no human attributes and inspired no personal devotion, so that Roman theology consisted only of knowing these gods and their powers, and seeking to influence them. However, Roman hospitality was offered to gods of foreigners, and in the case of the Greeks, the worship of Apollo acquired increasing influence among the Romans until finally they attributed honor to this god second only to that they accorded Jupiter.[23] The Romans identified the Hellenic divinities with their own, and assimilated the Greek myths and legends into their own religious creed.[24]

Oriental cults also made inroads to Italy. In contrast to Roman state religion, they offered personal fellowship with personal deities, and promised immortality. Orgiastic practices in elaborate rituals of worship appealed to the senses and emotions. The Great Mother of Pessinus, Cybele, was believed to be the source of all life in nature, and Attis, her consort, personified the death and resurrection of nature in winter and spring. The myth told of his dying by self-destruction, and Cybele's mourning until he was resurrected. On the basis of this belief, a ritual was practiced by which believers could also gain victory over death. The rites were orgiastic in character. The myth of Isis and Osiris was similar. Mithra, as the Sun-god against the god of darkness, and as the god of battle, became most influential in Rome by the end of the first century A.D. These Oriental mystery religions supplied something for the emotions and deeper longings of men, and their popularity reveals the soul hunger of the times.

In order to further understand the religious, or philosophical setting in which Paul and his auditors lived, it would be helpful to review the principal Greek philosophical systems and schools.

The Epicureans were skeptics and declared themselves against all religion. The world arose from chance, they taught, and there is no Providence. Pleasure is the ultimate end of life. Their beliefs will be discussed more fully in the chapter concerning Paul at Athens. The Academics were agnostics, and held it impossible to arrive at objective truth. Pilate's "What is truth?"[25] is an example of their questioning. They also questioned whether a god existed, whether the soul was immortal, and whether virtue was to be preferred to vice. The Aristotelians were deists. God is a principle giving motion to the machine, they believed, but he is perfectly indifferent to the affairs of men. Virtue and knowledge are linked, they taught, still clinging to the Socratic concept. The ideal life is a life of conduct in accordance with virtue, though man is equally capable of virtue and vice. Virtue and knowledge bring happiness and make man a good, effective "political animal." The Platonists had a high idea of God but limited him in his perfections. They believed the Soul is immortal.[26] Like Socrates, Plato refused to believe the view of the Sophists that truth is relative, that what is truth to one man may not be to another, and that knowledge is perception, as Protagoras claimed. True knowledge, Plato believed, is a knowledge of universals, and the summum bonum, as Socrates had taught, was the development of virtue and the attainment to a knowledge of God. The Sophist, content with mere popular notions of virtue, could not teach; only the philosopher, with true knowledge, could do so. Plato insisted that true education would bring virtue. This concept is an important feature of Classicism, for the Classicists held that man by his own resources could create a perfect world. Only recent world wars, atomic warfare, and continual lack of local and world peace has shaken men's faith in this concept. In his belief that man's nature could be transformed by education, Plato differed from Paul and the Gospel which declared that only the intervening grace of God can transform man's bias toward evil. In Socrates' frank letter describing his desire for the young man Charmides, we further see a difference between Socratic ethics and the ethics of Christian heritage which go back to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and further, to the Creation.

Platonism in the first century A.D., was unlike that of the fourth and third centuries B.C. Neoplatonism in the time of the Roman Empire was a synthesis of Pythagoreanism, Platonism, Aristoteleanism, Stoicism, and the Oriental cults. A part of Platonism reappeared in stoicism, but aside from that it had slight appeal in Paul's world.

The Eclectics held Plato in high esteem but selected from other systems whatever pleased them. They felt that in all systems many things seemed unreasonable and even absurd. They denied the supernatural and the immortality of the soul, making pleasure the end of life and bringing an alarming debasement of morals.

The Stoics were materialistic pantheists. Everything, they taught, including our souls, is a part of deity. Virtue is the chief end of life and should be practiced for its own sake. Freedom from passion is the mark of a perfect man. On its ethical side, Stoicism had much in common with

Christianity, and will be discussed more fully in Chapter V. Some of the great statesmen of the age do not indicate as much appreciation for the Epicureans as they do for the Stoics. Cicero, for example, often speaks of Stoic doctrine and admits to following it in many points; the Stoic philosophy is seen in Cicero's approach to argument; however, he seems to associate the Epicureans with political subversiveness, constantly refuting them.[27] This tendency seems to have continued to Paul's day, though probably to a lesser extent than expressed by Cicero. By the time of Paul the Epicurean sect was smaller and less powerful than the Stoic sect,[28] and was not regarded with the same respectability as the other schools in the Hellenistic world.[29] Regarding philosophy in general, Paul himself never adopted that attitude of antagonism toward it which became customary in the second century, springing from the changed circumstances of that period. The ideas of Greek philosophers, especially the Stoics and Epicureans, caused people to question former beliefs. This was true in spite of the fact that Augustus and later emperors tried to revive the old religion and even declared themselves divine.

The Greek religion was unique for its intimate association with the whole political and social life of the people. The religious atmosphere was all-pervading. The law courts and marketplaces were consecrated places and under the charge of certain deities. As civil judges, citizens could approve of a discussion of religion before the court. Acts of State were accompanied by sacrifice. The Athenians, in their religion, stressed aesthetics. Paul, out of a Hebrew-Christian background, stressed ethics. As Paul saw the Athenians' religion engrossed in art and amusement, he no doubt felt it was lacking in moral power. Though the Greeks did deal in moral investigations, their religious tastes were chiefly gratified by magnificent spectacles of tributes to various deities. Sensual excitement abounded during festive seasons and in religious ceremonies. Actually, the religion of the Greeks exercised very little control or direct influence on their morals or conduct.[31] Though there were still many admirable qualities about the people, they also exemplified skepticism, religious decay and moral corruption. Conybeare and Howson describe their religion as "beautiful beyond expression as giving subjects for art and poetry," yet "utterly powerless and worse than powerless, in checking their bad propensities."[32] Greek philosophy had exhausted the possibilities of the uninspired human mind, and the world was sadly in need of One who could say, "I am the way, the truth, and the life."[33]

The most radical difference between the various religions of the Empire, and Judaism, was that Jewish religion knew no realistic sacrament, no symbol containing in itself, and conveying to the worshipper, the divine nature or essence. "The kind of presence it sought and found through religious rites was a conscious union with God in the sphere of will, or even of mystic experience, felt to be due to God's own action in grace or loving kindness."[34]

Four influential parties represented the religious zeal of the Jews. The Zealot party represented Jewish hatred for the Roman overlords and constantly stirred up rebellion, sometimes successfully. The climax came in A.D. 70, when the Temple was destroyed by Titus during his siege of Jerusalem while quelling such rebellion. The Essenes were an ascetic sect living in small monastic communities. The Pharisees were the conservative interpreters of the Torah (Pentateuch) and responsible for the Rabbis who wrote the Midrash and Talmud. Their followers were from the poor classes, while the wealthier classes looked to the aristocratic Sadducees who possessed the priestly offices, accepted only the Pentateuch, and did not believe in a resurrection.

In Philo (approximately 20 B.C.-A.D. 53), the type of philosophical thought known as the Jewish-Alexandrian reached its highest development. He applied to the Old Testament the allegorical method employed for centuries by the Greeks to the interpretation of Homer, whereby they explained away everything deemed unworthy of the gods. Philo seems to have lacked the historical spirit, since he could not appreciate the progressive character of revelation, and understand the relation of the human and divine in Scripture. Hence, in order to show perfect harmony between Old Testament thought and Greek philosophy, he explained away whatever in the Old Testament seemed to him unworthy of God, childish, or opposed to Greek philosophy, by spiritualizing it. Thus, he came to the conclusion that everything that was wise and exalted in Greek philosophy lay concealed in the Old Testament. Philo also developed the Logos doctrine, and the relation between his teaching on the Logos and that of John is still a matter of dispute.

Jews of the Diasporo (which resulted in the far-flung synagogue system), were greatly influenced by Hellenistic culture, but "whatever the Jews took over from the Greeks was in form only, not in essence."[35] In general, no matter where they settled, they loyally adhered to the ancestral religion, and made proselytes from among the Gentiles. In the days of Augustus Caesar, synagogue scholars in every part of the world were pointing to the prophecies of Scripture, saying it was time for the Messiah to come,[36] and sharing their hope with a hungry world that looked for true peace of spirit. Prophecy had been silent for generations, but it was expected and longed for by pious Israelites. There was a longing for the return of Elijah or Jeremiah or another of the prophets. Later, Peter could appeal to this longing and expectancy on Pentecost, to explain the outpouring of the Spirit. The Jewish Dispersion paved the way for the diffusion of Christianity and prepared the Apostle to the Gentiles. Paul belonged to the Dispersion and his early environment and training prepared him to transmit to the west the life and virtues of a new culture, persuading Romans and Greeks and Jews alike that faith in Jesus Christ was the one thing needful.

The Hellenistic world was accustomed to accepting new religious thought and integrating or syncretizing it with already established religions.[37] Such an attitude prepared the way for Christianity, but also was a threat to this new religion. Syncretism changes and tends to submerge identity. This problem faced Paul. He could not compromise or refrain from presenting the force of the Gospel for fear his audience would see Christianity in the same light as other religions they had accepted, and then take the heart out of his message. Paul did not seem to wish to become involved in subtle philosophic argument, either. At Athens, for example, he wanted to lay a foundation for presenting Christ and His victory over death. In doing this, he evidently felt he had shown the dynamic nature of Christianity and its worth to his audience. Christ ruled not only his life, but also his thinking. The secret of Paul's theology is found

> . . . not in his speculative power, nor in his rabbinical training, or in his dialectics, but in the conception he had formed of the Lord Jesus Christ. To him, Christ was the motive of all right living; He was also the test of all true thinking. Paul brought all speculative and all practical questions to the test of the Person and work of Christ. This held his speculative power in subordination.[38]

The book of Acts describes the progress of the Gospel in the places and order of the Great Commission given by

Jesus: "And ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the Earth."[39] The Christ was first preached by His disciples in Jerusalem, then in all Judea and Samaria;[40] preaching did not close until Paul had proclaimed the same faith in Rome itself.

The early church was a new genre, revealing a love for all men, including self-declared enemies; the new faith appealed to educated and uneducated alike. Paul made converts among those in Caesar's palace,[41] for men reared in the wisdom of the Greeks and Romans, found in Christianity a more sublime philosophy. The differences between humanistic Classicism and Christianity were significant. First, since Christianity declared Jesus to be the only Son of the Father, He was "the God to end gods,"[42] as well as to end the divinity claimed by Caesar. Further, the Christian viewed time not as endless cycles, like the Greek or Roman did, but as moving in a straight line toward a definite objective: the kingdom of God, established at the coming of Christ in glory as promised in over three hundred places in the New Testament. God, not chance or Fate, was guiding history. Christianity further differed from Classicism in its view of the nature of man. As has been noted, Aristotle felt that man was equally capable of virtue and vice, and Humanistic Classicism held as an ideal the perfectability of man through knowledge, education, enlightenment: man through Reason could create the good life and the perfect society of virtue and peace. Christianity considered this classical ideal as deceptive, since man's character had been perverted by original sin. As Cochrane explains, "The doctrine of sin and grace marks, in its most acute form, the breach between Classicism and Christianity."[43]

In summary, the historical setting of the Roman Empire reveals a five-fold preparation for the coming of Christ, and the preaching of Paul: (1) Universal Empire prevailed, with the whole civilized world welded into an organic whole in which law and order were enforced, and during which excellent roads were constructed. By the extension of Roman citizenship throughout the Provinces, life was protected. (2) Greek was a universal language, and with it existed (3) universal peace and (4) universal need, due to a stress on individuality. This stress caused men to become concerned about their own souls, and to gradually recognize the flaws of Classicism. Finally, there was (5) universal expectation. The all-prevailing spirit of the Jewish religion was the expectation of the Messiah. This hope was inspired and strengthened by the Messianic prophecies, and transmitted to the Gentiles by the dispersed Jews and their Scriptures.

Paul lived in a highly developed intellectual age, in which Greek civilization with its matchless language, literature, oratory, art, philosophy, and science had been diffused over the whole civilized world. But the Gospel of Jesus Christ was superior to the culture and religion of the old Roman Empire, for history reveals that He overcame the political, intellectual, moral, and religious errors of the world, and appropriated and spiritualized the better elements of ancient civilization. As He proclaimed, "I have overcome the world."[44] In the Apostle's day, Greek and Roman culture had reached their highest point, and it is a historical fact that though God chose the Jews to furnish the substance of Christianity, in His prudent economy the Greeks and Romans contributed largely to its form.

The Form and Precepts of Rhetoric in the Greco-Roman World

It was the Classical Age in Greece that gave birth to the principles of rhetoric which, because of inherent worth, have been constantly reasserted from that age to this. Ancient oratory was a fine art, "an art regarded by its cultivators, and by the public, as analogous to sculpture, to poetry, to painting, to music, and to acting. This character is common to Greek and Roman oratory, but it originated with the Greeks, and was only acquired by the Romans."[45] In the Greek and Roman schools education was almost exclusively education in rhetoric, and rhetoric was habitually associated with all the liberal arts making up the cycle of instruction.[46] "The same teacher . . . who taught the arts of speaking and writing, also read great poems, histories, and public addresses of earlier ages with the boys"; thus, rhetoric was part of a core curriculum, "not to be taught as a separate and isolated skill, but an organic art, at work 'discovering all possible means to persuasion in any subject.'"[47]

The ideals and precepts of classical rhetoric can best be summarized by reference to the works of Cicero and Quintilian. Quintilian, though living in the age of the Second Sophistic, was by nature and teaching a classicist. "Cicero asserted, 'Great is the labour of oratory, as is its field, its dignity and its reward.' The audiences were not less exacting either, than the speakers were painstaking. The hearers were attentive, not merely to the general drift or to the total effect, but to the particular eloquence."[48]

In his De Partitione Oratoria, Cicero discussed the speaker's resources as a speaker, the speech itself, and the speech situation, which included the audience as well as the subject. The resources of the speaker were implicit in Aristotle and were deliberated upon by rhetoricians before they were ever discussed by Cicero. However, it was the famed Roman orator who, in such written works as De Inventione and De Oratore reflected the state of the art of rhetoric and formalized its canons, seeking to bring it back to its original scope and vitality. His concepts of eloquence form a link between the ancient and modern world. A Renaissance Man himself, it was he who insisted that no man can be an orator of merit, a complete and finished orator, unless he has universal knowledge, so that he is able to speak with fullness and variety on every subject. A good orator, Cicero declared, is a man of both letters and action.[49]

The speaker's resources as a speaker, or the functions of the orator as they were also called, are first, inventio: invention or discovery of speech materials, "the devising of matter true or probable which will make a case appear more plausible."[50] The Classical notion of Invention was not discovery but rediscovery, and stasis was dictated only by the logic of controversy. The other functions of the orator are: second, dispositio: or arrangement of speech materials; third, elocutio: the style, the language used in presenting the materials; fourth, memoria: memorizing the speech, and fifth, pronuntiatio: delivery of the message. The last two were omitted by some authorities since they were considered to be "more matters of nature than art."[51] Since it is impossible to prove from Paul's speeches in Acts, or from the speeches of the prophets, the extent to which they exhibited a classical ideal of delivery, the following chapters only lightly consider it. Apparently Paul's critics contended that he could evidence boldness only by means of letters from a distance, because his bodily presence (and presumably his delivery) was weak and his speech contemptible.[52] However, though Paul may not have possessed the kind of physique thought to be advantageous to oratorical delivery, centuries later Chrysostom described him by saying that though only three cubits in stature, the Apostle touched the sky. Further, when his critics termed his speech contemptible, they could not have been referring to the content of his messages, which they admitted to be weighty and powerful; they must have been referring to his style and delivery as being bereft of the qualities most esteemed in his age of the Second Sophistic. This point will be expanded upon later in this dissertation.

The six parts of a speech (partes orationis) are named in the Ad Herennium and in De Inventione.[53] The first three are the exordium, or opening, designed to make an audience attentive and friendly, the narratio, or statement of facts, and the divisio or partitio, the statement of the point at issue and preview of what the orator proposes to prove or elaborate upon. The fourth part is the confirmatio, or exposition of arguments for affirmative proof; the fifth part is the confutatio, or rebuttal of the opponent's arguments, and finally conclusio or peroratio is the conclusion.

Cicero discussed two kinds of speech situations: one which comprised a general discussion, and one that involved particular persons or occasions. The second kind, called causa or "case" concerned Aristotle's three speech categories, forensic, deliberative, and epideictic orations.

Since matter was considered to be more important than

6

style, in classical rhetoric, inventio was the chief source of the speaker. Classical rhetoric from Hermagorus to Quintilian consisted of a scheme for cataloging disputable questions, of status, topics, and line of argument. Status, the point at issue, was the point at which one rested with the potential of going in either direction. The orator was to investigate as many pertinent facts as possible and so determine the status of his case. On this status all the main issues turned. The speaker should inquire as to whether the matter of his speech depended upon a question of quality, fact, or definition, and ask other questions such as what a thing is, and what kind it is. Other questions concerned with forensic speaking, and adopted by the author of the Ad Herennium from his teacher were "Was it done or not?" (constitutio conjecturalis), and "Was it justified or not justified?" (constitutio juridicialis). Having decided on the status, the orator could next concentrate on the line of defense. The next step would be to apply these facts to persuasion.

Aristotle's three primary modes of persuasion were the character of the speaker, and the speaker's understanding of the audience: ethos; bringing the audience into a state of emotion: pathos; and arguments when truth is demonstrated by such means as inhere in particular cases.[54] Both Aristotle and Cicero felt that the orator must be able to reason or argue logically, discourse (logos) with knowledge, but he must also have a knowledge of human character (ethos) and emotions (pathos). For Cicero, knowledge of psychology and philosophy were necessities, and they, along with experience, pathos and ethos, served as foundations for style. (Creativity and insight were better than a list of rules on style. He echoes Isocrates here). For Aristotle, ethos included adapting the speech to the different age groups and classes of people within an audience, and Cicero said it must be recognized that a speech would have to be different for a cultured audience than it would be for an uncultured one. Aristotle stated that the speaker's character might almost be affirmed to be the most potent of all the means of persuasion. The primary emphasis of ethos was the effect upon the audience as judged by the audience. Ethos was revealed through the speaker's thought and choices in the argument of his speech. The conveying of a favorable impression of the speaker's character was extremely important in classical rhetoric: the ideal orator would convey the inner characteristics of virtue, competence, and goodwill. (Competence included practical wisdom, and intellectual virtue, while goodwill was treated as emotion of love and friendship.) Quintilian urged that rhetoric could not be divorced from morality because "only the good man can speak well."

Concerning the demonstration of truth, the five rhetorical questions, How? What? Where? When? and Why? could be employed to help devise arguments, and topics gave further assistance. Cicero listed in his work a number of such topics. These included Definitions, Contrast, Similarity, Dissimilarity, Consistency, Inconsistency, Conjunction, Repugnancy, Cause and Effect, Distribution of Past and Present, of Genus and species, and of More, equal or less.[55] (Aristotle's general topics included "Possible or Impossible?" "Has it happened or not?" "Will it or will it not happen?")

Cicero stressed that the arrangement or dispositio of a speech should be adapted to fulfill the orator's purpose; the effecting of persuasion was of more importance than following a set of rules. Thus, dispositio involved more than exordium, narratio, divisio or partitio, confirmatio, confutatio and conclusio; it also included the orator's judgment as to how arguments should be placed in order to affect the listeners.[56] Quintilian considered partitio to be contained in what he called the proof, and thus divided dispositio into only five parts.[57] However, Cicero remarks that some rhetoricians had only four parts and others seven.[58] The most complete and perfect form of argument was a fivefold one according to the Ad Herennium; this form will be discussed in later chapters.

Elocutio included correctness, clarity, propriety, and ornamentation, the four virtues of style which Cicero restored to rhetoric in the original simplicity and clarity with which Theophrastus named them.[59] During classical times, speeches were classified by Aristotle's different places (courtroom, legislative chamber, special occasion), and by purpose: that is, elocutio also included the plain, medium, and grand styles which were associated by Cicero with the purposes of oratory: to teach, to delight, to move (persuade). The orator should instruct, or speak of common matters, in the plain style; he should speak of great things in the grand style, magnificently, so as to move or persuade; and he should speak of moderate matters in a medium, pleasing manner so as to delight. Cicero stated that, like himself, the ideal orator would use all three styles, having them easily at his command. Such an orator must be able to use them in any part of his speech. In the majority of cases, all three must be used, the practice requiring a high skill.[60] Demetrius, in his On Style, spoke of a fourth style, the "forceful."

Ornamentation was a major topic of later rhetoricians who were interested in ways to embellish and liven up the orator's speech. Dionysius of Halicarnassus' Literary Criticism, Longinus' treatise On the Sublime, Demetrius' work, On Style, and Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria are replete with technical and complicated distinctions regarding various terminology and methods of style.[61] The author of the Ad Herennium gave a comprehensive and orderly list of various rhetorical ornaments, followed by definition and examples. The similie and example were much used devices, while

Apostrophe, the addressing of a person, city, or thing, was to be used sparingly. Annominatio, a pun, or play on words, was also to be used with moderation. Descriptio and Demonstratio were used for arousing emotion, and the figure of collecting together a number of points during the speech was said to have a forceful, cumulative effect.

In Orator, Cicero gave a detailed description of prose rhythm which he insisted contributed much to the success of the varied and vigorous style of the ideal orator. A balancing of clauses, and antithesis were two means of producing rhythm. "In general, the rhythm flows onward from the beginning, sometimes faster . . . sometimes slower . . . a vigorous dispute requires speed, exposition requires a slower rhythm."[62] Qualities of style will be discussed more fully throughout the following chapters. In Paul's time there was an increasing concern on the part of Rhetoric with all literature and its style, including poetry, letter-writing, history, philosophy, and speech.

By Memoria was meant both learning a speech by heart or mastering its substance in order to speak extemporaneously. Quintilian felt that memorizing was best if the speaker could do it, but otherwise the second method was allowed. The canon of Memoria is only touched upon in the following chapters. It is not likely that Paul's speeches were memorized, but obviously he has mastered their substance. A discussion of Memory is omitted in current rhetorical practice, and even Aristotle's Rhetoric did not give consideration to this canon, as did not the major rhetorical works from the 18th century onwards. Ancient orators were mainly wary of extemporaneous addresses, and even Demosthenes would never speak extemporaneously if he could help it because he was not willing to place his ability at the mercy of fortune.[63]

Delivery, or Actio, or Pronunciatio included the use of both voice and gesture. Cicero felt that delivery was the "sole and supreme power in oratory,"[64] and Demosthenes was often held up as a perfect example of the effectiveness and importance of this function of the orator. Quintilian stated that delivery must be pure and clear, embellished and appropriate in both voice and diction, and that voice and diction will be appropriate if adapted to the subject of the speech.[65] According to Quintilian:

> The orator should be as unlike a dancer as possible, and his gesture should be adapted to his thought rather than to his actual words.[66]

The orator was to use gesture according to the magnitude of his purpose, keeping in mind that oratory was serious pleading, not entertaining mime, and that the orator must present himself as a man of wisdom, sobriety, and temperance.[67]

Aristotle had conceded that there might be an art of delivery, although he observed that none had been formulated by his time. But classical rhetoricians persistently declared that such an art existed. Appropriateness was the principle upon which this art must be based. Voice and gesture were the colors available to the orator-artist.[68] Aristotle had briefly suggested only one or two examples of suiting the action to the word, but the Romans delineated much more carefully the potentialities of appropriate voice and gesture.[69] Both Cicero and Quintilian extolled the contribution that vocal utterance made to effective delivery,[70] the clarity lent to delivery by proper phrasing,[71] and the value of oratorical gesture. Next in importance to voice was facial expression, they said, particularly expressions of the eyes.[72] Short gestures belonged to trivial matters and themes of a gentle or melancholy character; longer gestures belonged to subjects of importance, or themes calling for joy or horror.[73]

Although the classic writers gave extensive attention to the subject of delivery, insisting upon the importance of its mastery, and elaborating certain basic and sound observations, nowhere did they attempt or recommend a methodizing of it. What they termed an art of delivery was learned by imitation of good models and by practice; this art, as any other, was based upon nature, and was ineffective unless motivated by true feeling.

Classical delivery encompassed content, verbal usage, and delivery. As advanced in the works of Cicero and Quintilian, the most admired and quoted authorities in the period, delivery occupied a position equal to that of thought, organization, and style. Essentially, Aristotle considered delivery as a spuriously effective proof, often serving to obliterate the matter; its appeal was to the unthinking audience. Sincere, reasoned discourse required only that delivery convey the thought in a manner which called no attention to itself. But classical rhetoric had no such low evaluation of it. To classicists, the art of persuasion was a whole art, and its practitioners could neglect no aspect of innate good will, learning, language, or delivery skills which served to persuade.

In discussing the speech itself, we come first to the exordium. Aristotle had first pointed to the need for an exordium by saying "It is plain that introductions are addressed not to ideal hearers but to hearers as we find them."[74] Quintilian adds that "he who is going to speak should reflect what he has to say, before whom, at what time or place, under what circumstances, under what prepossessions of the public."[75] The introduction was an important opportunity for conciliating the audience and arousing their desire to hear what the speaker wanted to say.

The usual school formula for narratio was that of Isocrates, who decreed that the statement of facts should be brief, clear, and plausible. Quintilian added that the purpose of narratio was to persuade of what has been done, or is supposed to have been done. There were three classes of narratio: That in which there was a straightforward exposition of the facts of the case, that in which narrations occurred incidentally in the course of the speech, and that which concerned things or persons. A formal narratio could be dispensed with when events had to be explained away by the argument. Then the facts would be distributed throughout the speech.[76]

Concerning proof, or confirmatio, as Clark explains, rhetoric concerned itself with contingent and approximate truths leading to differences of opinion; it was concerned with "persuasive argument used in support of the probability of one side of a debatable issue"; not with scientifically demonstrable truths.[77] The materials of proof used in the art of rhetoric were the enthymeme and maxim, and the example. An enthymeme was an incomplete syllogism with the major or minor premise omitted, its conclusion drawn from a premise of universal application or one based on public opinion and hence on probability. Quintilian considered syllogisms to be occasionally helpful in a speech, but did not like to see a mass of enthymemes crowded into an oration, or find it to consist only of syllogisms as if the speech were the disputation of a logician rather than the pleadings of a true orator. "For what true orator" he asks, "has ever spoken in such a way?"[78] Concerning examples, Cicero wrote that a corresponding or analogous case could be introduced to influence the audience, and that sometimes a fable, even an incredible one, could be introduced to support an argument. "The greatest support of a probability is furnished by first an example."[79] Aristotle believed examples that followed enthymemes had the effect of giving evidence, and were therefore effective. If examples were used first, a large number had to be given, but if they were employed after the stating of an enthymeme, a single one would be enough.[80]

Aristotle suggested that appeals to the feelings, amplification, and conciliatory devices could be included in the _peroration_, but for classical rhetoricians the standards of brevity and summarization seemed most important.[81]

Turning to the _speech situation_, it will be remembered that Cicero suggested that this could be one of two kinds: Either the speech situation involved a general discussion, or it was concerned with particular questions of persons or occasions and was called _causa_ or case. Aristotle dealt with particular questions or causes only, and categorized these under the heading of judicial, deliberative, and epideictic: _genus judiciale_, _genus deliberativum_, and _genus demonstrativum_.

The _genus judiciale_, or judicial oratory, had to do with the justice of actions taking place in the _past_, and was concerned with accusation and defence in the _courts_. This forensic rhetoric belonged to the advocate, who studied motivation and both civic and natural laws. It was chiefly forensic oratory which required status, and a statement of facts; the five-fold division of a speech also applied particularly well. Cicero summarized this traditional division as follows:

> . . . before we speak on the point at issue, the minds of the audience should be conciliated; next, our case should be stated; then the point in controversy should be established; then our allegations should be confirmed and those advanced refuted; and . . . at the conclusion of our speech what is in our favour should be amplified and expanded, what favors the adversary should be weakened and demolished.[82]

Specific questions concerned with forensic speaking have already been mentioned.

The genus deliberativum, or deliberative oratory, had as its aim utility, according to Cicero, and was concerned with security and honor. Also referred to as political oratory, its chief place being the Senate or forum, the deliberative speech advocated some course of action relative to the future, answering such questions as "Is this proposed action necessary? Is it possible? Is it expedient or profitable? Does it contribute to security? To honor?"[83] In regard to these questions, Cicero pointed out:

> As a speech must be adapted, not alone to the truth, but also to the opinions held by the audience, we must first realize that the people are of two kinds, one uneducated and uncultivated who prefer utility to honor, and the other humane and cultivated, who place honor above all things.[84]

Finally, the epideictic oratory, or genus demonstrativum, was concerned with praise or blame, the topics of praise being divided into mind, body, and estate. This type of oratory, according to the author of Ad Herennium, rarely occurs in real life, but occasion for it is usually found in forensic and deliberative speeches. It is delivered from the standpoint of the present, and could have as an effect the moving of the audience to an imitation of the one praised. Epideictic oratory was treated in a meagerly fashion by Cicero in De Inventione, and almost banished in De Oratore. However, it seems to have gained some popularity again when style became the dominant aspect of rhetoric.

In his De Inventione, Cicero declared that the orator should be concerned only with the causa or case, but in De Oratore he reversed his position, stating that all controversies can and should be related to the essence and nature of a general question.[85] In his Orator he asserted that the orator should, whenever possible, divert a controversy from particular persons and occasions to universal abstract questions, because whatever is proven of the whole is automatically proven of its part. One "can debate a genus on wider grounds than a species."[86] Thus, by the "nature and variety of his own interests" Cicero was forced, almost as Isocrates was, "to take a broad view of rhetoric or the philosophy of the word, and to include a great deal that Aristotle's narrow view of rhetoric excluded."[87]

Forensic and political oratory, prevalent in the life of Roman citizens, offered students opportunity to observe the principles and practice of oratory. Due to Grecian influence and the Romans' natural aptitude, the art of oratory had not only been an essential part of the educational system by the time of Paul's era, but it was also cultivated in very special fashion. Yet it was not taught by an elaborate system of rules as was done in Greece. "The youth were encouraged to listen to the words of the great orators, and then by imitation of word and gesture to perfect themselves in public speaking."[88] From the use of the marketplace, as well as the law courts, forum and senate, the student of oratory was trained in a typically Roman, vital, practical manner. Cicero in his rhetorical works highly recommended this practice. Five centuries later, St. Augustine echoed this recommendation in his work De Doctrina Christiana. One wonders how often the young alert Saul might have listened to orators in the marketplaces of Tarsus.

Cicero attempted to show the need for both eloquence and wisdom in a true orator, and in his De Inventione asserted that the ideal orator is the man who pursues the highest virtue and the common good, having the treasure of eloquence to adorn these qualities.[89] The same idea occurred in his De Oratore: eloquence must be combined with wisdom. He further maintained that oratory and philosophy were divorced through the efforts of Socrates who usurped the term "philosopher," which had once been common to both fields of human endeavor. In trying to patch up the quarrel, Cicero declared:

> I will give full leave to anybody who wishes to apply the title of orator to a philosopher who imparts

> to us an abundant command of facts and of language, or alternatively, I shall raise no obstacle if he prefers to designate as a philosopher the orator whom I on my side am now describing as possessing wisdom combined with eloquence. . . . the prize must go to the orator who possesses learning. . . . the consummate orator possesses all the knowledge of the philosophers.[90]

Cicero maintained that Philosophy was a very important part of the training of the ideal orator who must be acquainted with all things worth knowing. "There is not a subject that is not the orator's own, provided only that it is one which deserves elegant and impressive treatment."[91] ". . . No one can discuss great and varied subjects in a copious and eloquent style without philosophy."[92] With these conciliatory words Cicero may be said to have combined the two main disciplines of the ancient world. Philosophy was to be the source of truth, and rhetoric the tool. Eloquence did not derive from rhetoric, but rhetoric from eloquence. No doubt great men can attain to eloquence without theory, Cicero suggested, but art is a better guide than nature.

As Demosthenes had been Greece's greatest orator, Cicero was Rome's preeminent speaker. Roman oratory never had as much imagination and grace as the eloquence of Greece; yet, though it was very practical, Roman public speaking was not entirely lacking in beauty, imagery, and poetic quality. In time these latter qualities became quite marked in Roman oratory, to the extent that in the eloquence of Cicero, the oratory of Rome came to rival that of Greece in its golden era. The outstanding use of rhetoric faded away with the deaths of Demosthenes and Cicero, in their respective countries and eras. "When the impulse of great thoughts was removed with the departure of freedom, attention was diverted to nicety of expression."[93]

Quintilian restated the recommendations of Aristotle and Cicero that the orator have a full training in all types of subject matter. He expanded the concept, however, to cover what we might term today a liberal education. Interestingly, "Paul's letters bear traces of Hellenic culture up to the level of a man of liberal education"; and in this period, according to Edward, "the study of the art of expression as crystallized in the schools had become the higher education of the day."[94] "Quintilian believed in the integration of various fields of knowledge. He saw relationships among all subjects and was persuaded that knowledge in a given area could not be mastered successfully if separated from other areas."[95] Above all, Quintilian's theory of speech-making is significant for its insistence upon high ethical standards. He said of the perfect speaker, "The first essential of such a one is that he should be a good man, and consequently we demand of him not merely the possession of exceptional gifts of speech, but all the excellences of character as well."[96] Cato had defined an orator as "a good man speaking well," but Quintilian adds the concept of education by defining the perfect orator as a good man trained in speaking.

The Second Sophistic.--Since, as Caplan states, "eloquence flourishes best on soil dedicated to free institutions,"[97] it is not surprising that eloquence began to decay at Rome in the first century.

> Under the dictatorship of the principate, freedom of discussion in the school and in the forum ceased. It was not safe to discuss live issues. The more remote from reality or fictitious a theme was, the safer it was. Rhetoric is a living force only under some form of democratic or republican government.[98]

Without the compulsion of great themes demanding expression, rhetoric became an end in itself rather than a means. The purpose of an oration became the giving of effectiveness to the speaker, catering to personal triumphs and exhibitionism, rather than the giving of effectiveness to truth. Hence, there arose what is known as the age of the Second Sophistic. The "age" is more of a viewpoint, however, than an historical period.

The Stoic view was in direct opposition to sophistic concepts. In the early period of his life, Dio Chrysostom (40 A.D.-120 A.D.), an able, famed, and eloquent defender of Paganism, from Antioch,[99] was a sophist and opposed the philosophers. However, he was converted to the Stoics and set aside his sophistic ideas.[100] This fact indicates that the Stoics did not adhere to the sophistic view of rhetoric, probably because that rhetoric lacked true subject matter.

In Plato's day, the first sophists had flourished. "A sophist in the genuine sense of the word was a wise man--a clever man--one who stood prominently before the public as distinguished for intellect or talent of some kind."[101]

However, Plato condemned the sophists of his day for using trickery in persuasion. Protagoras, an outstanding sophist, claimed to be able to teach how to make the worst cause appear better, a factor which was a source of severe criticism on the part of later philosophers, especially Plato. One of the chief sophists was Gorgias who invented a "kind of prose poetry in which sense counted for little and sound for much, in which phrase balanced phrase, and word jingled with word." Words, Gorgias claimed, could make the lowly appear grand and the grand lowly, the old seem like new, the new like old.[102] Gorgias aroused Plato's antipathy because of the stress he placed upon persuading men to any belief or action regardless of the means needing to be used. It was this unscrupulous emphasis which gave an immoral tone to the whole school of sophistical rhetoric, and it was just this aspect of the art that drew down upon it the persistent hostility of Plato. The sophist, Plato asserted, "has an art, as it were, of human appearances; he will easily take advantage of our poverty of terms to make a counter attack, twisting our words to the opposite meaning; . . . he deceives and . . . his art is an art of deception . . . our mind is led by his art to hold a false opinion . . . you surely . . . will not grant the art of dialectics to any but the man who pursues philosophy in purity and righteousness."[103] In his Phaedrus, Plato did admit that a genuine art of rhetoric might exist, but added that "a real art of speaking . . . which does not seize hold of truth, does not exist and never will."[104] . . . Since truth is reserved for the philosopher, no man can be a real propounder of truth unless he is trained in philosophy, with a knowledge of man's nature and purpose. Sophism, Plato accused, merely harmonizes with public opinion, not always with truth, making "the same thing appear to the same persons at one time just and at another, unjust."[105] The ideal rhetorician will be a philosopher who knows how to avoid being led from truth into the opposite of truth.[106]

In spite of protests such as Plato's, by the first century A.D., sophism had again won a prominent place in rhetorical theory and practice. The rhetoric of what is termed the Second Sophistic was, as has been noted, a result of democracy's demise, so that the people no longer had a voice in public affairs. Under the heavy-handed decisions of the emperors, neither deliberative nor forensic oratory could flourish, leaving only epideictic oratory to speakers. The nature of the sophistic tendency was a result of its being founded on no theory. Its style was not considered as a whole, and thus no care was taken to preserve the vocal Greek symmetry of parts. Logical sequence and reasoned presentation were neglected. From such a tendency arose exaggeration. An overzealous desire for grandeur would cause the orator to say everything in a manner of wording that should have been kept for grand concerns. At other times, the sophist would make a point regardless of whether the basic thoughts were obscure or made ridiculous by the turn the argument was being given. As Jebb states, the orators oscillated "between bombast and importune epigram."[107] Cicero maintained in the Orator that artificial gloss was taking the place of vigor in oratory. Truth does not tolerate such gloss in its treatment. Whereas Invention had been given the place of preeminence among former canons of rhetoric, the Second Sophistic placed Style and Delivery in the position of primacy and almost ignored Invention, except as it existed in ready-made forms. This oratory was the "art of the technician, not of a composer."[108] The same stock patterns used by beginning boys were used by experienced men in public oratory. Because of the use of stock illustrations and phrasing, the Second Sophistic was poor in vivid imagery.[109] Further, as Lucian warned, the avoidance of stern endeavor such as sophistic orators exemplified in the matter of inventio would, if followed in the moral realm, lead to sordid private life: the opposite of what classic rhetoricians urged as providing ethos.[110] Sophistic and Classical rhetoric were philosophically apart, but Sophism was on its way to gaining preeminence. Paul lived in, and especially had his early schooling in this period of rhetorical transition. The Second Sophistic, with the Asianism-Atticism controversy, is discussed further in the chapter pertaining to Paul at Athens.

By the second century, the eminence of Sophism was undisputed. As late as 86-82 B.C., when the Ad Herennium was written, the art of rhetoric was still being taught out of a framework of vital issues of the times. But by the end of the first century and the early second century A.D., such men as Tacitus, Seneca, Lucian of Samosata, and Quintilian were talking of rhetoric as having been separated from the realities of life.[111] Tacitus (born A.D. 55), said of the period, "Our age is so forlorn and so destitute of the glory of eloquence that it scarce retains the very name of orator."[112] Baldwin has explained that Sophistic is "the historic demonstration of what oratory becomes when it is removed from urgency of subject matter."[113]

It would seem that the influence of Cicero of Rome and Demosthenes of Athens, whom Cicero admired and used as a model, would have remained even during this Second Sophistic movement. However, Baldwin reveals that such was not the case. The teachings of the Second Sophistic were strong enough to survive even the fall of the Roman Empire, and St. Augustine, who reverted to the concepts of Cicero, was one of the first strong challengers against the sophistic concepts.[114] Divine inspiration such as moved Augustine ultimately regenerated rhetoric.

In terms of time, as has been noted, Paul belonged more to the era of the Second Sophistic, but his attitudes and practices were very different. The primary motive of self-exaltation made sophistic unfitting and unworthy. Furthermore, Paul's chief aim was not to please, but to persuade.

The Mind of Paul

In order to completely comprehend and appreciate the speeches of Paul, it is necessary to understand the personal influences and experiences which caused him to live, think, and speak as he did. Certainly a knowledge of his world view is helpful in comprehending his choice of words and manner of speaking, as well as the tremendous success of his ministry. It is impossible to dispute Stalker's statement that to Paul the Apostle we owe "hundreds of ideas which were never uttered before":[115] Ideas which were divinely inspired and propagated. As Kuist asserts:

> It was the result of his extensive teaching-travels throughout the Roman world that a Jewish sect became a world religion. His work was so important that some have even called him the second founder of the Christian church. He united the Occident and the Orient by bringing to Europe a religion which originated in the Orient. In this one way he predetermined the history of Europe to the present day.[116]

One quarter of the New Testament is written by Paul and another quarter, written by Luke, provides the only information about the Apostle we have outside of the Epistles. Further, more books have been written about this man and his ideas than about any other person in history with the exception of Jesus Christ. In the field of oratory and rhetorical criticism, the influence of Paul is just as marked. Every book or set of volumes, claiming to represent in some way the world's great orators, lists a large number of preachers and social reformers who took their cue from Paul the Apostle. In his time, "the working and thinking classes, with the students, if not the Professors at the universities, were also attracted to his teaching, and it spread among them with a rapidity that seemed to many modern critics incredible and fabulous, till it was justified by recent discoveries."[117]

> He is a potent factor in social evolution. He is one of the determining influences in our Western civilization. The prints of his fingers are on our institutions. His ethical ideals stand in the marketplace. His ideas are running in our blood. He has woven himself into the fiber of our consciences and conduct. We are influenced by him even when we are least conscious of him. . . . The whole world would today be different had Saul of Tarsus never lived.[118]

The Book of Acts alone gives us sufficient evidence of the success of the persuasion used by Paul, not on one occasion, but time and again. Some of these evidences may be quoted:

> And when Gallio was the deputy of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection with one accord against Paul, and brought him to the judgment seat, saying, This fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law.[119]
>
> And it came to pass in Iconium, that they went both together into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake, that a great multitude, both of the Jews, and also of the Greeks, believed.[120]
>
> And some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few.[121]

We are told that the Apostle conducted a preaching tour that "turned the world upside down."[122] It cannot be gross exaggeration to designate him as perhaps the most effective preacher the Church has ever possessed. He came into the Christian ministry at a time when it desperately needed him.

> It needed a man of unlimited versatility of education, of immense human sympathy and breadth, to go out there with the gospel message; a man who could not only be a Jew to the Jews, but a Greek to the Greeks, a Roman to the Romans, a barbarian to the barbarians; a man who could encounter not only rabbis in their synagogues, but proud magistrates in their courts and philosophers in the haunts of learning.[123]

Paul traveled by land and sea, exhibiting presence of mind under every pressure and in every variety of circumstance, never cowed by difficulties. "No man of this size belonged to the original apostolic circle, but Christianity needed such a one, and he was found in Paul."[124] As Milman states:

> To propagate Christianity in the enlightened West, where its most extensive, at least most permanent conquests were to be made; to emancipate it from the trammels of Judaism,--a man was wanting of larger and more comprehensive views, or higher education, and more liberal accomplishments. Such an instrument for its momentous scheme of benevolence to the human race, Divine Providence found in Saul of Tarsus.[125]

Shortly after Paul's death, probably at Nero's command, the temples of Rome and of Jerusalem, the Capitoline Jupiter, and the sanctuary on Mount Zion, were destroyed: as if, Fisher suggests, "to signalize the death of the hero of the faith, who had smitten with a fatal blow the stupendous fabrics of Gentile and Jewish worship."[126]

Early Jewish, Greek and Roman Influence on Paul and His Oratory

What were the formative influences responsible for shaping the character, temperament, and extraordinary genius and oratory of Paul?

Taking note of the influences upon Paul's life, Samuel Sandmel observes, "Three main influences, summarized, are that he was a Jew, and therefore at home in the Bible and the exposition of it; that he was a product of Greek civilization, and also at home in it; and that his conversion was the most significant influence of his life."[128] Sandmel, a modern Jewish scholar, explains, "For Paul . . . Judaism in its usual form had become inadequate . . . The need of the imperiled individual was not for the symbol representing God, not for His codified word, but for direct communion with God Himself."[129] Sandmel continues elsewhere, "The force of personalities--Jesus: the inspiration, and Paul: the inspired--thus brought to birth out of Greek-oriented Judaism and its search for salvation a new religion, a religion clearly the product of its ancestry and yet uniquely itself."[130]

Jewish Influences on St. Paul.--The Apostle Paul was born "a Hebrew of the Hebrews." In Acts we hear him declare before the Council of the Jews, "I am a Pharisee and the son of Pharisees."[131] Before King Agrippa he says, "I am a Pharisee and my life was that of the strictest sect of our religion."[132] Again, he testifies that he is a "Hebrew, an Israelite, a descendant of Abraham."[133] The Apostle was born into a family of the Pharisees about a year or two before the birth of Christ. The Pharisees "despite too frequent intolerance and traditionalism, comprehended most that was godly and all that was patriotic in the later Judaism."[134] Probably when he was born, the names of Saul and Paul or Paulus were given him. The Hebrew "Saul" means "asked for." The New Testament tells us that Paul had one sister (whose son was loyal to him in one instance at least), but no other sisters or brothers are mentioned. "Paul" is the name by which he is called among the Gentiles. "Paulus," a Roman name, means "little." Because, as was noted in Chapter I, Paul's father had received Roman Citizenship, the doors of the whole Roman Empire were open to the Apostle. Such a citizenship could be obtained by having an influential Roman bestow it for services rendered; by purchasing it for a large sum of money; by being granted it through acknowledgement of some distinguished personal service to the State; or by receiving it as transmitted from one's father. The tradition that the entire city of Tarsus was granted Roman citizenship as a special privilege seems to be without proper evidence or foundation.[136] That Paul's citizenship was of great value to him is revealed in Acts.[137]

Since the Jews believed the home to be the supreme educational institution, the significance of Paul's early years cannot be overlooked, and are no doubt reflected in his later admonitions to husbands, wives, fathers, children, and servants.[138] The modern Rousseauian theory that parents must be more wise and good than their children, in order to win their children's respect and obedience, had no place in Hebrew convictions. Jewish parents claimed authority, and ruled by divine right.[139]

According to the Talmud the main duties of a father were to circumcise his son and teach him the Torah. The child was also to be instructed in a trade, not because his parents were poor, but because it was a Jewish custom that every boy should learn practical skills by which he could support himself if necessary. The child was also to be told the stories of sacred history and was to be given symbolic instruction through the Passover and Pentecost activities, as well as through the everyday duties of his home. These duties and activities conveyed a sense of God's reality, holiness, and lovingkindness. Thus the "child's religious consciousness was awakened, stimulated and nurtured."[140] Tacitus states, in his Dialogue on Oratory, that for a boy to be destined to be a great orator his home training must be suitable; he must have strict discipline from his parents; they must regulate his studies with "scrupulous piety and modesty," and must develop in him a "pure and virtuous nature."[141] Paul's parents, as conscientious Jews, probably did these things. Furthermore, the "emphasis upon purity and uprightness of character so much emphasized by Paul and the other early missionaries--their heritage from Judaism--is almost certainly one of the principal reasons for the steady growth and eventual triumph of Christianity."[142]

As soon as a Jewish child was old enough to understand, he was taught to memorize the Scriptures, and he continued to do so when he reached the age of seven and was sent to the elementary school attached to the local synagogue. Later, at about the age of 15, he literally sat at the feet of some learned rabbi in the Holy City. This stress upon learning the Old Testament is one of the most evident influences upon Paul, traceable in his oratory as well as in his writings. In his letters he quotes from the Old Testament over 95 times and refers to such Scriptures at least half again as many times more. In his oratory he reveals the influence of pedagogical and rhetorical elements in the Hebrew Scriptures. The personality and rhetoric of Moses no doubt inspired the avid young student Paul. The Apostle quotes from, or refers to, Moses 25 times; Moses, in the period of pre-Christian education, was the greatest of schoolmasters, and was an excellent orator.[143] This ancient prophet's own fellowship with and obedience to God brought truth with power to all of his speeches; his life, as well as his words, radiated truth. No doubt his example challenged the young and zealous Pharisee named "Saul."

As a young man, Paul also studied the Talmud, a work by the whole Jewish nation as well as others who indirectly contributed to it: a book of Jewish civil and religious laws and ethical lore. Such training was as useful when Paul turned against the views of the Jews as before, for it gave him an understanding of his hostile audiences. Paul did not quote from the Jewish traditions after the manner of the Rabbis of his day, but his arguments sometimes reflect the rabbinical mode of discussion, and amply attest to his ready acquaintance with Hebrew history, and the Torah, as well as with the prophets.

It was no accident that one who has been styled "the second founder of Christianity" was born and bred a Pharisee. Rather, it was through personal proof of the limitations of legal Judaism that Paul came to distinguish so clearly between it and the Gospel of Christ. Because he was able to do this, Paul could present Christianity as the universal religion for man as man, not as merely a sect of Judaism with proselytes of its own. "For this and nothing less, was the issue involved in the problem of the relation of Christianity to the Jewish law; and it was Paul who settled it once and for all." G. Stanley Hall credits Paul also with proving that the death and resurrection of Jesus were so important.[144] (More will be said about this later.)

Along with his teaching in theology, Paul must have received additional training in rhetoric. This rhetorical training probably started in Paul's hometown in the local synagogue and was continued in Jerusalem. Gerald M. Phillips writes of the type of rhetorical instruction the Rabbis gave to Jewish students in their Talmudic academies. These were often held in the synagogues. The period when such instruction flourished was from the first century A.D.

to the sixth century.[145] The particular study by Phillips deals with the instruction in the synagogues of Babylon, but he indicates that the same type of instruction went on in all the schools of the Jews.[146]

In these schools the students received many opportunities to speak in public. The educational process was through discussion and disputation. Speech occasions were also provided by special events in the community. When an academy head retired, all of his students gave orations on the formal occasion of retirement. These orations dealt with synthesis of knowledge obtained from the instructor who was retiring. Other formal occasions provided opportunity to give ceremonial speeches, such as ordinations, funerals, and weddings.[147]

Speeches given in the regular sessions of the academy were subject to questioning and disputation.

> Because of the spontaneous nature of the speaking situations, it is apparent that the bulk of the speaking during the regular sessions was extempore but well based on a sound knowledge of the literature and thought of the times.
>
> Some sessions were held which presented lectures by authorities other than the chief rabbi. . . . Students challenged the lecturers' statements and were then required to prove their case to the officiating rabbi.[148]

Such training in extemporaneous speaking must have helped Paul when he was unexpectedly called upon to speak formally or to defend himself. Paul argues like a Rabbi in Romans I, II, and III, and in his use of allegory,[149] and in his fine distinctions even in the use of singular and plural.[150]

Much advice was given to students concerning discussions with non-Jews. The Rabbi was to know what answer to give to the Epicureans, for example.[151] The aid of such study to Paul as he spoke to the Athenians is obvious.

The academies differed from rhetorical practice in Greek and Roman schools in that there was, in the academies, no actual concept of an art of public address; speaking, as has been noted, was almost entirely extemporaneous, for there is little evidence of preparation.[152]

The college at Jerusalem during Paul's tutelage was presided over by one whom the Jews still refer to as the "Great Rabbi." Gamaliel was of lofty character, unquestioned integrity, and enlightened mind. A Pharisee strongly attached to the traditions of the fathers, he was, nevertheless, tolerant of Greek culture. He appears in Scripture as one of great soul and wisdom.[153] One cannot avoid surmising the great Christian he might have become, had he allowed himself to be more susceptible to the claims of Christ. Nevertheless, under such a Socrates another young Plato was to sit, one who would again incorporate his master's wisdom, and, again, surpass it.

What type of education did Paul receive at the college in Jerusalem? James Stalker paints yet another picture of it for us:

> The course of instruction which a rabbi had to undergo was lengthened and peculiar. It consisted

> entirely of the study of the Scriptures and the comments of the sages and the masters upon them. The words of the Scriptures and the sayings of the wise were carried on about disputed points; and by a rapid fire of questions, which the scholars were allowed to put as well as the masters, the wits of the students were sharpened and their views enlarged.[154]

It is not hard to see where Paul developed his marvelous memory, his keenness of logic, and his original treatment of many subjects.

Greek and Roman Influences on St. Paul.--The Graeco-Roman culture of Tarsus also influenced Paul, even as it encroached upon Judaism. Paul was familiar with the Scriptures in the Hebrew language, but he was more conversant with the Greek translation known as the Septuagint. His early childhood language was Koine Greek, although he was competent in the Aramaic vernacular of Palestine, also. Paul's native Tarsus was "no mean city,"[155] mainly Greek in population and incorporated with Rome, the world's "principal seat of learning."[156] The people of Tarsus were imbued with zeal for philosophy, and students flocked to her schools from other lands. Yet she needed no foreign teachers, and, in fact, had no room for her many learned sons, sending them abroad to Rome and other places to enlighten men.[157]

In spite of these facts, however, the weight of evidence in scholarly circles suggests that Paul did not ever attend the University of Tarsus, but that his education was strictly Jewish, allowing for no lengthy formal training from Gentiles. His Rabbi Gamaliel,[158] grandson of the famous Hillel, was known for his study of the writings of the Greeks, as has been noted, and Gamaliel was later ranked among the seven greatest teachers of Israel. It is generally felt that Paul's knowledge of Greek literature, philosophy, and rhetoric was a result of Gamaliel's influence. Still, Paul's knowledge of the pagan world and thought came primarily from his mixing with men rather than with books. Pattison mentions Paul's "cultivated style, reasoning mind, treasury of illustration, and knowledge of human nature."[159]

On the other hand, Mary Larrimer, in The Life of Paul of Tarsus, insists that his real oratorical training was doubtlessly acquired in the schools and universities in Tarsus. His use of the languages shows he was well learned, and the curriculum of that time included rhetoric and oratory:

> Famous schools congregated in the city. Platonists, Peripatetics and Epicureans taught their respective systems. Their curriculum, called Encyclopaedic, covered rhetoric, mathematics, ethics, dialectics, grammar, music, various forms of athletics which included boxing, racing and swimming, and famous courses in poetry and oratory.[160]

Hence, Larrimer points out, Paul had the opportunity to receive direct training in the art he applied in such an effective manner.

Others testify of Paul's acquaintance with such philosophers as those he encountered in Athens. Ramsay says Paul must have heard many of them speak often in his hometown.[161]

Some of the headmasters of the school in Tarsus were recognized as outstanding Stoic philosophers, and Mahaffy goes so far as to say that the coast of Cilicia had one of the strongest Stoic influences of the Hellenistic world.[162] However, both of these men, along with Farrar and most modern biographers of Paul, reject the idea that he gained either literary tastes or Stoical philosophy from the instructors of Tarsus themselves. If he had, would not a writer such as he, who often thinks in quotations, have revealed traces of and allusions to Homer, or Aeschylus, or Sophocles, in his orations and epistles? And if he had received training from the Sophists of Tarsus they surely would have succeeded in enfeebling the energy of his style and reasoning.[163] Paul's cosmopolitan outlook came chiefly through his citizenship of Tarsus which gave him opportunity to mix with men of all classes and nations. McGiffert, who says that Paul does not betray a wide knowledge of Greek literature, also declares that Paul was "moulded by intellectual Greek tendencies that were abroad in the Greek world of the period."[164] In an account in Acts, Paul speaks boldly for the Lord's cause, "talking and debating with the Greek-speaking Jews,"[165] and in another place, a Roman colonel is surprised that Paul is able to speak the Greek language,[166] perhaps especially so when immediately afterwards the Apostle addresses a crowd of Jews in Hebrew.[167] James Hardy Ropes points out that many details which spring to Paul's mind are Greek, and would not be in his writings if he had not lived in daily association with the Greeks. "And in order to develop some of the remoter and sublimer consequences of his own thought of Christ, he was forced to use categories which become clear to us only through a knowledge of the Greek philosophy of Alexandria."[168] Ramsay says that Paul explains the suffering and apparent evil in the world in a form that is characteristic of Hellenic philosophy,[169] and Glover believes that Paul, having been exposed to Greek thought, no doubt thought in Greek as well as in Aramaic.[170] Kinsey claims that Paul learned not only the history and traditions of his own nation at Tarsus, but also the Greek approach to life, an excellent training for one who was to be "the Apostle to the Gentiles."[171] Kinsey goes further with an illustration of Paul's possible use of Greek source material in his first letter to the Corinthians. The parable of the members of the body[172] was not original with Paul, Kinsey explains, and the Apostle was probably indebted to his classical background. Socrates had pointed out the absurdity of hands and feet working against each other when God made them to cooperate;[173] and Livy records a story similar to the Apostle's illustration.[174]

Though all authors do not agree on exactly how much Greek education Paul may have had, all agree that the Greek language, thought forms, and approach to life, show up definitely in his orations and epistles.

The Roman influence played its part, too. The record in Acts makes a number of references to Paul's Roman citizenship.[175] William Quayle notes that Paul was the widest traveler we have record of in the Roman world of his day, and notes seventy-six different places which Paul was in or visited, or passed through.[176] Ramsay states that though the force, fire, and depths of Paul's nature are Hebrew, "his Jewish power is tempered and ordered and in a measure guided by his Greek training and his Roman position in the world."[177] Ramsay holds that without the fundamental influences of being a Roman Jew of Tarsus and being born a Roman citizen, Paul could never have been what he was.

Paul probably laboured at his trade of tent-making in Tarsus following his years of rabbinical training in Jerusalem. In all likelihood he was there during Christ's years of teaching in Palestine. We do not know for certain what year Paul terminated his education in Jerusalem, and are not really certain where he went immediately afterwards. He could have become an officer in a synagogue in most any city. We do know, however, that soon he returned to Jerusalem, arriving there shortly after the death of Jesus. It is not conceivable that Paul was in Jerusalem during the ministry of either John the Baptist or Jesus, for undoubtedly he would have been involved as an opponent in both these movements and he, or someone, would have recorded the fact. Instead, compelled to join the practical world of men and things while tent-making, Paul conversed with the Gentiles in the public places of Tarsus, being prepared to become all things to all men. This, too, had its influence on his oratory. Probably he listened to young student orators practicing their art of speech in the marketplaces, also. Still, perhaps the greatest influence came from the obvious fact that the highest culture of Tarsus, and the most thorough education, without a knowledge of God, could not banish darkness from men's souls, or satisfy their hunger of the spirit. Bereft of divine revelation, Tarsus was the center of orgiastic idolatry, impurity, gluttony, and brutality.[178] Paul would have seen the statue of Sardanapalus, traditional founder of Tarsus, cynically snapping his fingers while represented as saying the inscription on his pedestal: "Eat, drink, enjoy thyself; the rest is nothing." This helplessness and hopelessness, Paul could see, was the best that Paganism had to offer.

The Appearance of the Apostle Paul

A speaker's physical appearance can do much to an audience. A good physique readily attracts attention. We have no conclusive evidence, but all accepted views place Paul at a disadvantage in this respect. Even those who have viewed the statues in his honor describe him as small of stature, bald, and unattractive generally. In addition, Morton describes him as "a man little of stature, thin-haired upon the head, crooked in legs, of good state of body, with eyebrows joining the nose somewhat hooked, full of grace; for sometimes he appeared like a man and sometimes he had the face of an Angel."[179] Hastings gives the same description but adds, "Curly scant hair on the head."[180] Dibelius bluntly describes him as "short . . . bald and bow-legged," but adds, "a prominent nose," and that Paul was "vigorous and full of friendliness."[181]

The descriptions are taken from the apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla which is alluded to by Tertullian. Amos Wilder calls such description "fanciful," and points out that one of the characteristics of Christian literature nearer the source is that it never gives such physical description of its people. (External appearance was not so important.) Actually, Christian visual art did not begin 'till the third century.[182] Nevertheless, one such description of Paul is attributed to a damsal of Iconium who heard him preach. Other accounts of Paul's appearance in the flesh are found, for example, in John Malalas and Nicephorus. While no one can vouch for the authenticity of the above descriptions, it is noteworthy that they were written at an early date and may have recorded the impression that Paul made upon men. Pictures and statues believed made from memory by those who knew Paul coincide. It is generally conceded that Paul's appearance was more a liability than an asset. He doubtless referred to himself when he wrote of having "this treasure in earthen vessels";[183] however, the conclusion of the above-cited Scripture reads: ". . . that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." Though Paul may not have possessed personal beauty, Tacitus, an influential writer of the period, says a despised appearance does not keep one from being a brilliant orator.[184] The Apostle had other characteristics which were more persuasive.

> The speaker was thoroughly convinced of that which he said, and profoundly in earnest when he commended his convictions to others. The great master of ancient eloquence (Cicero) said that dramatic action was the first, second, third requisite of successful pleading; but no art can rival in its effects the outspoken utterances of disinterested sincerity, no address is more certain to command the sympathy of an audience than that of a man who pleads from his heart.[185]

Undoubtedly Paul's physical deficiency was overcome with this very striking characteristic. Sir William Ramsay describes him thus:

> Moreover, the Paul of Acts is the Paul that appears to us in his own letters, in his ways, and his thoughts, in his educated tone of polished courtesy, in his quick and vehement temper, in the extraordinary versatility and adaptability which made him at home in every society, moving at ease in all surroundings and everywhere the center of interest, whether he is the Socratic dialectician in the agora of Athens, or the rhetorician in the university; or conversing with kings and proconsuls or advising in the council on shipboard or cheering a broken spirited crew to make one more effort for life. Wherever Paul is, no one present has eyes for any but him.[186]

The last sentence of this quotation mentions a very useful organ in the matter of persuasion: the eye. Two of the most remarkable instances of Paul's power over others are prefaced by the statement that Paul "fixed his eyes on" the man.[187] This phrase suggests that his steady gaze was a marked feature of his personality, and one source of his influence over those brought in contact with him. Other accounts tell of his piercing gray eyes and winning manner.[188]

As an orator Paul evidently used gestures wisely. He enforced a point to the Ephesian elders by showing them "these hands."[189] When addressing the audience at Antioch and the Jews in Jerusalem, we are told he beckoned with his hand.[190] When addressing Agrippa and the distinguished audience in the Roman Governor's hall, he "stretched forth his hands."[191] He evidently used characteristic but hardly conscious gestures as a feature of his more impassioned oratory, but when he spoke in a more quiet manner, where gestures would not be suitable, no gesture is mentioned.

It would appear that Paul possessed a reasonably strong body despite its outward appearance, as evidenced in the many physical hardships he underwent. "In labors more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep. In weariness and painfulness, in watching often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness."[192] A person of weak physical makeup probably could not endure such trials. On the other hand, there is abundant testimony that a number of persons who have made their mark in history did not necessarily possess strong bodies, and underwent much suffering. John Chrysostom and Henry Martyn, Alfred the Great, and William III are such examples, not to mention the early colonial preacher in our own country, Francis Asbury. Ezra S. Tipple in his biography of Asbury gives us a vivid description of this man's sufferings:

> It must not be forgotten in any estimation of Asbury as a preacher that he was ill almost continuously throughout his life, and seldom without pain. At times he was so weak that he had to be carried out and placed upon his horse, and when the day's journey was at an end, lifted from his horse and carried into the house. Scarcely a day passes that he does not make some mention of suffering. He glories in tribulation. He speaks of sickness as a cross given him to bear.[193]

A number of scholars agree that the Apostle Paul fought a weak body and innumerable sufferings much of his life.[194] Morton quotes from Hasting's dictionary "that the astonishing work done by this man was accomplished not in the robustness of a healthy body or in the self-consciousness of one able at all times to have absolute confidence in himself, but amid weariness and painfulness, shyness and self-distrust."[195]

Paul's "thorn in the flesh" has been a subject of debate for years. There are many theories about what it was, but no one can actually be sure. A few believe it was a disease or weakness of the eyes. His own mention of it is simply: "There was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure. For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me."[196] With this "thorn" "buffeting" him, Paul deserves even more credit than would generally be his due, for it is evident that by God's grace he overcompensated for any deficiencies he may have had or felt; and it is certain, by Paul's own testimony, that the thorn contributed to his humility. (Some people feel that he needed this reminder now and then.)

The Personality of the Apostle Paul

It is impossible to consider any speech apart from the speaker himself because the content and form of his message, together with his manner and character, fuse into one. Therefore, some general assessment of the characteristics of the Apostle Paul is in order.

By inheritance Paul no doubt received traits found in Edersheim's characterization of God's "peculiar people."

> Excitable, impulsive, quick, sharp-witted, imaginative; fond of parable, pithy sayings, acute distinctions or pungent wit; reverent towards God and man, respectful in the presence of age, enthusiastic of learning and of superior mental endowments, most delicately sensitive in regard to the feelings of others; zealous with intensely warm Eastern natures, ready to have each prejudice aroused, hasty and violent in passion but quickly assuaged.[197]

Kuist agrees that this characterization of the Jewish people fits Paul,[198] and Ramsay says he concurs with "Principal Garvie"[199] in that he regards the Jewish inheritance, nature, and training as fundamental and dominant factors in the thought and life of the Apostle.[200]

Paul was bold, and undaunted by danger, not afraid to preach the Gospel anywhere. Driven out of the city of Thessalonica by a portion of the Jewish population, he went to nearby Berea and again began preaching in a synagogue, the heart of the Jewish community.[201] Stoned at Lystra and left for dead, he rose up and went back into the city, and after preaching at Derbe he returned to preach again at Lystra.[202] Paul was willing to die for Jesus, as he once wrote: "According to my earnest expectation and my hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, now as always, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether by life or by death. For to me, to live is Christ, and to die is gain."[203] The Apostle believed there was nothing in the human realm that a Christian need fear, for, he contended, God had not given to Christians a spirit of fear, but rather of power, of love, and of a sound mind.[204] Therefore, Paul fearlessly and reasoningly communicated the facts of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ, facing potentially hostile crowds in the synagogue, marketplace, and even on Mars Hill.

As a man of conviction and integrity, Paul was concerned about the truth and a proper communication of it.[205] He did not hesitate to point out error when it occurred even in such an eminent Christian as the Apostle Peter,[206] or among the intelligensia of Athens.[207] He lost no time correcting the impression of the people of Lystra,[208] who thought the apostles were gods; he was quick to join Peter and others in correcting those of the early church who were insisting on the necessity of circumcision,[209] and he instructed more thoroughly those Ephesians who did not know about the Holy Spirit.[210] He cautioned the Corinthians about eating meat once offered to idols,[211] and he advised the Romans to obey the authorities who were ruling them.[212] Yet Paul was so free from envy and jealousy that he rejoiced when Christ was preached even though the motive might be envy of Paul[213] or just pretense.

Another intriguing quality of Paul was his earnestness and energy in any purpose he set forth to accomplish. He was so forceful and energetic in the persecution of the Christians that the Pharisees sought after him for this purpose. It has been said that his pharisaical intolerance is even to be seen after his conversion to Christianity; in that he cursed anyone who preached a gospel other than that which he himself preached, contrary to, or more than it; and he cursed anyone who did not love the Lord.[214] When he found he was wrong in persecuting the Christians, he took time out to reorganize his purpose and then set forth with even greater zeal on his new object. It takes true greatness for one to see he is wrong, admit it, and to work among the same people on the opposite view of the question. Likewise, it takes greater persuasive powers to work under these reverse conditions, for one must meet greater opposition and criticism. One-time friends make the most bitter and cruel enemies.

Paul also demonstrated the characteristic of dedication. His dedication was to please God no matter what the cost. In a section of his writings immediately following the scathing condemnation of false teachers, in which he stated that anyone preaching false doctrine should be accursed, Paul queried, "For am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God? Or am I striving to please men?" Then, responding to his own question, this man who frequently referred to himself as a bond-servant of Jesus Christ,[215] answers, "If I were still trying to please men, I would not be a bond-servant of Christ."[216] As a men-pleaser, Paul could have opted for a syncretic position on Mars Hill, or he could have presented Christ as just another of many gods. But either stance would have been a compromise of his convictions, and Paul's dedication would not allow that. He always chose to present the truth regardless of the cost.

A further manifestation of Paul's character was his great concern for the welfare of others' lives and destinies. In relation to the Jewish people of his day, Paul evidenced his ardent desire that they come to the truth by stating: "I am telling the truth in Christ; I am not lying, my conscience bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit that I have great sorrow and unceasing grief in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were accursed, separated from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh."[217] Paul further substantiated his feelings when he wrote, "Brethren, my heart's desire and my prayer to God for Israel is that they might be saved."[218] It may be assumed that because Paul considered himself "the Apostle to the Gentiles," and because the major portion of his evangelistic work was among non-Jewish people, he was very much indeed concerned for the Gentiles, also. One evidence of Paul's concern was his willingness, as well as his ability, to adapt his messages to his audience, whether that audience consisted of a crowd, or a single individual, cultured or uncultured, educated or uneducated. He always met people on their own ground and showed the way for their growth and development from there.

Jefferson, in his Character of Paul, represents each of Paul's many characteristics in a full-length sermon, each sermon well-grounded on accounts in the New Testament. Included among these characteristics are Paul's sincerity, his weakness and strength, his pride and humility, his vehemence, patience, courage, courtesy, his indignation and tenderness, his breadth and narrowness, his sympathy, thankfulness, joyfulness, trustfulness, hopefulness, his love and loveableness, his religiousness, and his greatness.[219] McGiffert calls Paul a "cosmopolite," at home with all types of people, a "profound, original, independent thinker," and a "religious devotee."[220] Glover sees in Paul the "quickness, the sensitiveness, with which he responds to what he sees, what he hears, and what he divines."[221]

There is some evidence that Paul could have been married, with even the probability that he had had children. Being a member of the Sanhedrin, he came under the standing Jewish rule that a man be married and the father of children in order to rule justly and exercise mercy. The practical experience of family life would aid in assuring this. Should Paul have been married, his wife and children died at an early age, for he writes to the Corinthians as an unmarried man,[222] and there is no reference to a child in the flesh.

Some critics believe that Paul's real character, as revealed in his letters, is a paradox, and that he is a man of unrelated extremes:

> When people in Corinth say of him that his letters sound full of strength but that in person he is unimpressive (II Corinthians 10:1, 10), when we see ourselves how quickly he changes from severe censure to conciliation (II Corinthians 1:5-11), when people complain that no reliance can be placed in his plans for his journeys (II Corinthians 1:13; 2:1), we get the impression that sternness and gentleness, heights and depths, are side by side in his character. If, in addition, we take into account the almost constantly emotional nature of his language, and the excitability of his thoughts and feelings, the question arises of

> itself whether all this cannot be traced back to a highly sensitive nervous constitution.[223]

Probably Paul was of a highly nervous temperament, and a man of strong, sometimes volcanic emotions. Had he not been, his letters would lack much of their color, and his influence might have been less. It is difficult to conceive of any individual steeped in the message Paul proclaimed, being unemotional or altogether of a bland, placid personality. Such a combination would in itself be the real paradox.

Paul's bold, aggressive nature, combined with his deep-seated dedication to proclaiming the message of Christ to the world, make his orations in Acts a natural extension of courage and commitment. More about his character will be revealed in succeeding chapters.

The Conversion Experience of Paul

The most significant of all factors influencing Paul has yet to be considered: it is the Damascus road experience. Paul was entrusted with the work of utterly up-rooting Christianity, a program the Jewish authorities were intent upon. Convinced that he was engaging in God's work, he accepted the authorities' challenge. The stoning of Stephen had started a movement of violence that soon broke the Jerusalem church into pieces and scattered its members over all of the neighboring provinces. But apparently one consideration was overlooked by the Jewish authorities. "They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word." The blood of the martyrs was then, as ever, the seed of the Church.

Damascus, the capital of Syria, was one of the notable cities to which the Jerusalem Christians spread their "detestable doctrines." Paul requested and obtained special permission from the high priest to bind and bring back to Jerusalem those persons in Damascus who were involved in the proclamation of the blasphemous theology. On the one hundred and sixty mile journey to Damascus Paul had much time for thought. Perhaps he heard once more the dying prayer of the martyred Stephen, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge."[224] No Hebrew, nor Pharisee would have so prayed. By what authority could any Am har-aret pray that way? (Am har-aret was a term applied by the Pharisee to the common man, who did not care about the Law, and was regarded as cursed.) Some characteristics of the Christians, even a Pharisee had to admit, bordered closely on the admirable. However, to claim for their leader the cherished title "Messiah" and elevate him to divine authority as the Son of God was blasphemy worthy of death.

That Paul did reason within himself many times, perhaps even before this trip, is evident by the statement Jesus made to him, "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks!" However, there is danger in overemphasizing the psychological wrestlings of Paul's conscience, lest we fall into such psychogenic language as the following quote seems to do:

> The four or five days march to Damascus may well have been a time of intense internal struggle. At last, as they neared the city, the truth flashed upon Paul. These people were right after all. Jesus of Nazareth had risen, was living, and if so, he was Messiah and God. And as he sank overwhelmed to the ground, he was aware of the personal presence of the Lord, listened to his reproach, and humbly accepted his command. Saul entered Damascus a changed man.[225]

The record in the book of Acts points to a miraculous divine experience, not just a change of heart as the result of a purely psychological upheaval. Men will differ in their views as to exactly what happened on that occasion. However, one thing is certain. The persecutor stopped in his tracks and became a zealous protagonist of the cause he had so vehemently opposed. A result so tremendous calls for a cause of equal magnitude. The theory of an epileptic fit is entirely incongruous with the history of this hardy, enduring missionary. An optical illusion would certainly have to be powerful to give its witness the sensation of blindness for several days and to revolutionize his thinking. The majority of mankind would require an extraordinary event to make them turn their backs on their present mode of living and on their friends, to become the hated quarry of an enraged nation. Some scholars of unimpeachable character and enviable scholarship have changed their minds in the matter of Paul's conversion. Sir William Mitchell Ramsay and Adolf Deissmann, an English and a German scholar, respectively, travelled to Asia Minor and Palestine to explore the lands of Paul. The results of years of exploration placed these scholars beyond their original skepticism and in the ranks of orthodoxy. Both have written learned volumes concerning the Apostle, prepared to accept Paul's own word concerning what happened to him on the Damascus road. Though there are a number of theories about the experience, yet, as Stevens puts it, "no explanation tallies with all the facts which are known to us except that which Paul himself gives."[226]

Paul's later history and achievements conform to the message he believed Christ gave him that day. It is hardly sufficient to say that Luke invented the story, for most fabricators would have been far more careful to make the three accounts apparently harmonious in every detail. The carelessness of the writer in this regard suggests his honesty. Luke at first states that others in the company also heard the voice Paul heard, but in reporting Paul's speech from the castle stairs later, seems to correct this minor detail by quoting him as saying they did not hear the voice. The little discrepancy in detail gives no real conflict in the essence of the story. "Essential facts in the three accounts are the same"; "the slight variations in the three . . . do not seem to be of any consequence."[227] Certainly the phenomenon of the Epistles and of Paul's orations requires a cause which if not identical with that given in Acts, must be yet as miraculous. For whatever happened, the result is clear. Paul believed he had been confronted by the risen Christ and commissioned as a world herald of the faith he had persecuted. According to Paul, Jesus said:

> I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But rise, and stand upon thy feet; for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith in me.[228]

Regardless of one's attitude toward Paul's version of what happened to him, the words he quotes admirably and significantly sum up his subsequent career. If we say he was deluded in what happened to him, we must say this precise conformity of his testimony to his later history was only a very strange coincidence. The key words--to serve and bear witness, delivering you from the people (Jews) and from the Gentiles, that they may turn--summarize the remaining life of Paul. Luke continues the record by saying that when Ananias prayed for Paul, so that the Pharisee's sight was restored, Paul was then told, "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard."[229]

> Every word in this address strikes some chord which we hear sounded again and again in Paul's epistles. The new convert is not, as it is so common to say, converted from Judaism to Christianity--the God of the Jewish fathers chooses him. He is chosen to know

> God's will. That will is manifested in the Righteous One. Him Saul sees and hears, in order that he may be a witness of him to all men. The eternal will of the God of Abraham; that will revealed in a righteous Son of God; the testimony concerning him, a Gospel to mankind--these are the essentially Pauline principles which are declared in all the teaching of the apostle, and illustrated in all his actions.[230]

The fact that the conversion experience of Paul is the culmination of an inner struggle points to it also as being a "crux" or turning point in his life. Frequent direct application of this experience is used by Paul in his speeches to validate and vindicate his ministry. It was his explanation to all who needed to know of his otherwise enigmatical and sudden change of heart. Jones notes, "The importance of it in his speeches is due to the fact that it was the one and only explanation of his life and career."[231] "In the divine reckoning, Saint Paul's life begins from his conversion and his call to the Gentiles. The conversion is the epoch-making fact. On our conception of that one event depends our whole view of his life, and every action must be considered in its relation to the conversion."[232] McGiffert adds, "The great principles upon which his life was based stood out always clear before his mind, and gave form and direction to all he thought and said and did."[233] "Paul believed at a particular period in his life the risen Christ appeared to him, and to that appearance he owed his Christian faith."[234] The meaning of the conversion is well-affirmed in Dodd's words:

> The divine love that through Jesus had found

> Zacchaeus the publican had now through the risen Jesus found Paul the Pharisee. Henceforward the central facts of life for Paul were that while he was yet a sinner God had found and forgiven him, and that this was the work of Jesus Christ in whose love the love of God had become plain. About these two foci in experience his theology revolves.[235]

Lewin notes that his first preaching was "Jesus is the Christ" and that "his preaching was rooted in experience and conviction."[236] Sandmel writes, "His conversion is the most significant influence in his life: the Greek and Jewish influence are for him general qualities; His Christian faith is his specific character."[237]

The result of Paul's experience is the consciousness of the constant and real presence of Jesus Christ; Christ had effected his salvation by His death and resurrection, and he was now actually one with Christ.[238] McGiffert writes, "Out of that experience, out of the revelation of the Son of God within him, was born the conviction to which he gave such constant expression, that Christ had redeemed him by making him completely one with Himself."[239] This attitude of Paul helps us understand his preaching. It was the experience of having been made "a new creature"[240] through the power of Christ. Formerly he had been without Christ; now he was completely united with Christ. He possessed a new spirit, a new reason for living; he had to preach "Jesus is the Messiah," and a knowledge of Jesus was essential to this message. As Robertson asserts, "It is true that Paul cared more about the right interpretation of Jesus and the proper attitude toward Him than he did about the mere historical events of the earthly life of Jesus. But a careful study of Paul's epistles and his addresses in Acts will show that he knew all the crucial points of that life."[241] Because of this knowledge, and because of the divine revelation in the conversion experience, "he became the greatest intellectual expounder of Christ in all history."[242]

Stevens makes a good summary of the inner struggle which led up to Paul's personal experience when he says, "We may see in this inner struggle an indirect preparation of his heart for the acceptance of the Gospel. It had taught him his own weakness and insufficiency."[243] The inner conflict of Paul is well-depicted by him in the seventh chapter of Romans.[244] Dodd makes much of this inner conflict,[245] which he finds expressed in such things as the "war in my members,"[246] "when I would do good, evil is ever present with me,"[247] and similar statements found in Romans 7. Dodd, like some others, compares Paul to Luther in his early attempt to give up "the Law." As a perfect Pharisee, Paul took pride in this Law, and thus persecuted the Christians zealously. But he did not find perfect satisfaction in this hatred; here again, Dodd compares Paul before Damascus with Luther before Rome.[248] At his conversion, Paul's pride left him and he discovered he could not keep the law.[249] He "threw in his lot with One Who was irretrievably cursed by the law"[250] so that Paul now was not "God's outlaw, but

Christ's in-law."[251] McGiffert comments on this: "Though not 'prepared' for conversion, he had reached the principle of which Jesus had made so much, that all external observance of the Law is worthless unless it is based upon the obedience of the heart."[252] "That Romans 7:24 represents the condition of his mind in the days immediately preceding his conversion there can be no doubt."[253]

Martin Dibelius states one aspect of Paul's conversion that should be considered. "Paul was not 'converted' from a life of sin to a life of righteousness; one might rather say that he turned from a religion of righteousness to a religion of the sinner."[254] However, for a proud Pharisee to acknowledge himself "the chief of sinners,"[255] is certainly conversion in the deepest sense of the word. Paul had sincerely believed he was doing God's will. Like Luther and Wesley who followed him, he felt he was as close to the will of God as his knowledge and conscience permitted him. But, again like Luther and Wesley, he was to receive a further revelation from God, which would make his former life "sincerely wrong." Luther and Wesley certainly did not have the literal experience Paul had, a personal vision of Christ, but essentially the same conversion took place. Stevens writes, "Paul's assertion, 'By the grace of God I am what I am" (I Corinthians 15:10) was the presupposition of his whole life work."[256]

Certainly Paul himself never entertained any doubts about the fact that he had been in the presence of the divine Lord on the road to Damascus. As John Knox interprets:

> When Paul speaks of himself as a "man in Christ" he refers to the fact that he has, by God's grace, been made a part of that ultimate, eschatological order, that divine community of love, which in the Gospels is called the Kingdom of God, and which is already proleptically and partially present among us as the Church, whose "spirit" (that is, the inner principle which constitutes and distinguishes it) authenticates itself both as the Spirit of God and as the continuing reality and presence of Christ.[257]

This interpretation is based on Paul's own witness, for one of the main things the Apostle says about the experience of conversion is that he saw the Lord.[260] He had been commissioned as surely as the Twelve had been. Jesus was as much a reality to him as He had been to them. Paul insisted on his experience, not only as the authentication of his apostleship,[261] but as the proof of the Lord's presence in his life,[262] and an actual mandate from the Master Himself to preach the Word.[263] Pattison says, "Paul's experience was to see first the divine glorified Christ. He knew 'the power of His resurrection' before he felt the 'fellowship of His suffering.'[264] This fact, as it changed all his life, also colored all his preaching."[265]

George Duncan has paraphrased Paul's testimony in Second Corinthians 1:8 to read: "And this experience is not something which I can view in isolation; it colors my whole outlook on life; for I recognize that a God Who has so dealt with me once is essentially a God of comfort and a God of salvation, and He Who delivered me then will deliver me still."[266]

Concerning the implications of Paul's conversion for the Gentile world particularly, Hutton has said, "Certain it is that in every version of that vision, both that in the Galatians and all the three versions in the Acts, the prominent feature is the same, and is not the feature we should a priori expect to mark the conversion of a strict Pharisee--namely, that he is the chosen instrument to preach to the Gentiles."[267]

Thus, from the moment of his conversion Paul's life was redirected. He was baptized, broke his three days' fast, and began to preach in the synagogues that the expected Messiah had arrived in the person of Jesus Christ. The greater part of the succeeding three years was spent in Arabia in a period of seclusion and study characteristic of the preparatory work of many Biblical figures. As Paul says:

> But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia. . . ."[268]

It seems that meditation in Arabia brought Paul into contact with the contrast with himself and the Divine life. There, under the teaching of the spirit of God, his theological thought developed. From Arabia Paul returned to Damascus to preach again, until a Jewish plot against his life forced his escape. Arriving at Jerusalem, he found that the leading disciples were suspicious of him because of his prior reputation. Barnabas befriended him, relating Paul's Damascus experience and his preaching there which resulted in the Jews taking counsel to kill him.[269] Paul then preached at Jerusalem, but once more had to flee from the hostility he aroused. This time he returned to Tarsus where he proclaimed his message until Barnabas arrived. Barnabas suggested that Paul come and help preach at Antioch, and after a little more than a year there, Paul was ordained and sent forth with Barnabas on a Gentile mission. While the earlier chapters of Acts speak of "Barnabas and Saul," following the pair's commission and arrival at Paphos, the order is reversed, and it is "Paul and Barnabas" from then on, or "Paul and his companions."

Contrasting his ministry with that of pseudo-apostles, Paul tells the Corinthians:

> Are they servants of Christ? I am more; in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; In journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; In weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.[270]

Besides being a superb example of ethos, these words picture again how exactly Paul's life after the Damascus road experience had corresponded with the forecast there given to him. He had served and borne witness; certainly he had stood in constant need of deliverance from Jewish and Gentile persecution, and just as surely many of his listeners had turned from their former way of life to the way of Christ.

Thus we are compelled to recognize in the crisis of Paul's life recorded in Acts the most important of all the factors which influenced his oratory. Whatever that experience was, it left the Apostle with definitive values, major concepts, and immovable convictions which henceforward shone through every sentence he uttered. It has been said that there are no subjunctive moods with Paul. This is true and the reason may be attributed to the influence we have just considered. Hereafter he is a man "in Christ" and this he recognizes to be the answer to the soul's struggles after righteousness he had known as a Pharisee. Christ is risen indeed, Paul asserts, or "we are of all men most miserable."[271] And because Christ is risen, He will come again according to His promise, to redeem from this life or the grave all who have become his heirs by simple confiding trust. Therefore Paul is a debtor unto all men, and woe to him if he preach not the good news of forgiveness of sins and power through Christ. These convictions are the doctrines Paul employs to motivate believers to holy living. All his preaching now becomes that of a man who looks "not at the things which are seen but at the things which are unseen . . . the eternal."[272] In Philippians 3:12 with a graphic metaphor he pictures himself as assuredly laid hold upon by Jesus just as a prize is grasped by a victorious Athlete, adding that he himself forgets the past, lays aside all weights, and sin, and presses "toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."[273] This assurance and this passion are the secrets of Paul's persuasive eloquence.

Other Elements in the Philosophy of the Apostle Paul

The philosophy of an individual often dictates his actions as well as his words. In studying the Apostle Paul, a further understanding of his world view is helpful in comprehending the purpose behind his travels and actions, as well as his choice of words and manner of speaking. Paul's philosophy has already been represented as having its focal point in Jesus Christ, and the reality of His resurrection.[274] Paul had proof that Christ did arise--proof in that the majority of the five hundred different people who had seen Christ alive, after the crucifixion, were still alive when he wrote his first letter to the people living in Corinth,[275] and because he, himself, had seen the Lord. The Apostle therefore boldly traveled everywhere preaching that Jesus arose from the dead.

Another element of Paul's philosophic thought was his belief that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."[276] The result of sin is death: i.e., spiritual separation from God.[277] Since man has fallen short of God's standard of holiness and is therefore deserving of death, if there is to be any salvation for man, it has to come from God. Paul believed that God initiated and completed that process, for "when the fulness of time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law, in order that He might redeem those who were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption as sons."[278] Now all that man can do, according to Paul, is believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and he will be saved.[279] For man, faith is of prime importance: faith in God Who through Christ offers salvation to repentant man. C. H. Dodd, in his work on Romans, reports, "The word faith is one of the commonest terms in Paul's vocabulary."[280] And the revelation of righteousness here spoken of, Dodd asserts, "is a revelation by faith and for faith, and therefore fulfills the condition implied."[281] The Apostle describes his preaching as repentance toward God and faith toward Jesus Christ.[283] However, man's belief in Jesus had to be couched in the belief of the resurrection which was the proof that Jesus was truly the Son of God. Therefore, Paul preached, "If thou wilt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."[284]

When Paul was first converted, immediately he was thrown into a complete transformation of thought patterns. Several problems were particularly pressing. One was the "enigma of the cross." "For it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree."[285] Jesus was hung upon the cross, the most ignominious death known to a Hebrew and, as far as the Hebrew was concerned, to God Himself. How then could God allow One He supposedly favored to die such a death? Furthermore, ancient philosophers were certain that God, or a godlike man, could not suffer. To say, then, that God's Son could suffer and die upon a tree was saying the impossible. But the "impossible" had already happened to Paul. A proud Pharisee had become a humble follower of a Nazarene who claimed to be the Son of God. Paul knew the preaching of the cross would be foolishness to the Greeks and a stumbling block to the Jews. Such preaching had been a stumbling block to Paul, to the extent that he had attempted to destroy it.

What then was Paul's solution to the problem? If God Himself had decreed the cross a curse, then He must have placed a curse upon His Son. Paul realized that that is exactly what happened. "For He hath made Him (Jesus), to be sin for us, Who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."[286] God pronounced judgment upon sin in His Son. The cross becomes a crown; a curse becomes a blessing. Henceforth, Paul will glory in the cross, for by it salvation is obtained with righteousness in Jesus Christ.

Another problem for Paul was the problem of the Law. Paul was a most thorough student of the Law; his entire life had been devoted to it. Now he was to find himself in serious conflict with it. A Judaizing group of Christians were to be a "thorn in the flesh" the rest of his life. The issue would finally be resolved in the Council of Jerusalem in Paul's favor, but such a resolution would be more theoretical than actual in the minds of many of Paul's contemporaries. What was the problem of the Law? God had chosen the Jewish race from among the nations to outline and proclaim His message of salvation to all men. God had clearly revealed Himself through the prophets of this nation. He was to separate them uniquely from the other nations. He regulated their entire lives with rules intended to set them apart and teach them about the character, the unutterable love and holiness, of God. Every detail of life was prescribed for them in the Law. While this Law was a severe yoke, it was also a matter of distinct national pride. The Jews felt that God had bestowed on them the greatest honor He could bestow upon any nation, as in a sense He did. No other nation had received such an abundance of distinct revelation from "the true and living God."

> Their thoughts were all pent within the circle of this national conceit. Even their hopes about the Messiah were colored with these prejudices; they expected Him to be the hero of their own nation, and

> the extension of His kingdom they conceived as a crowding of the other nations within the circle of their own through the gateway of circumcision. They expected that all the converts of the Messiah would undergo this national rite and adopt the life prescribed in the Jewish Law and tradition; in short, their conception of Messiah's reign was a world of Jews.[287]

Paul, as the "Apostle to the Gentiles," was inevitably to confront the real problem of the Law: Gentile conformity to it. Was it necessary for the Gentile to assume all the ritualistic rules and regulations of the Jew, including the rite of circumcision? According to the Law, yes. But Paul contended that Christ had set aside the absolute observance of the Law, not merely for the Gentile but for the Jew as well. Christ alone fulfilled the letter of the Law. No one else could have possibly done so. Had any other fulfilled its requirements, the purpose of the cross would have been nullified. The Law was, and is, but God's "plumb line" (Amos 7:7-9) against which every man is aligned and found wanting. Man's salvation could not be obtained by good works or a blameless life. The pious Jew strove all his life to fulfill the requirements of the Law, but he had to admit in the final analysis that he had failed. The Apostle Paul himself was such a Jew. No one was more zealous for complete compliance with the Law. However, as has been noted, in the seventh chapter of his letter to the Romans he records his utter failure. The Law condemns him; it becomes in the end a curse.

In the providence of God it was given to Paul to resolve this paradox. The solution reached was not a human achievement, but a divine revelation. Even a man of Paul's genius could not have arrived at such conclusions apart from divine assistance. The Law is understood as playing the part of the slave who conducts one to the school of Christ.[288] Paul had in mind the slave or attendant who conducted the young Hebrew lad to his classes at the school --perhaps the very slave who had conducted Paul. The Law condemns us, proves that we fall short of God's requirements, and constitutes every man a sinner. We are brought to the very place where God can deal with us in His Son. Salvation becomes a gift, not an accomplishment. We accept the merits of Another, denying our own.

How gracious a message for Paul's struggling, conscientious brethren! How gratefully all those at Antioch, for example, ought to have received such a message. As Luke writes, "And he expounded the matter to them from morning till evening, testifying to the kingdom of God and trying to convince them about Jesus both from the law of Moses and from the prophets."[289] But many blatantly rejected it. Failure upon failure to reach them finally sent Paul forth specifically as the "Apostle to the Gentiles."

Regarding Paul's doctrine, his use of proof from Scripture takes first place. Weizsacker points this up clearly.[290] For Paul it is not only the point that Jesus died and rose again, but that it happened according to

Scripture.[291] This is the firm basis of the Antioch sermon, and it forms the climax of his speech before Agrippa and Festus in Caesarea, as well as in the synagogue in Corinth. There he bases his remarks to the Jews on the Scriptures and declares their fulfillment in Christ. C. A. A. Scott's observation in this respect is, "The Old Testament provides his one quarry for illustration and religious vocabulary."[292] Martin Luther says, "There was never any that understood the Old Testament so well as St. Paul, except John the Baptist, and John the Divine. St. Peter excels also. . . . St. Paul translated much out of Hebrew into Greek, which none besides were able to do; in handling one chapter, he often expounds four, five, or six. Oh, he dearly loved Moses and Isaiah, for they, together with King David, were the chief prophets. The words and things of St. Paul are taken out of Moses and the prophets."[293] Another time Luther says, "St. Paul read Daniel thoroughly, and uses nearly his words, when he says, 'The son of perdition will exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.'"[294]

As a Jew, Paul followed the Jewish teaching concerning God. In his appeal at Lystra are the two elements of monotheism and repentance, and these are seen again at Athens, clothed in philosophical language. McGiffert reminds us that "in both Athens and Thessalonica Paul preached one living and true God Who would yet judge the world by Him Whom

He had raised from the dead."[295] Maurice Jones suggests that Paul's doctrine of God varies in points of view as he addresses himself to Jews, Gentiles, or Christians.[296] Paul had to adapt his teaching to the needs and comprehension of his pupils. To those more practiced in Christian thought, Paul is more philosophic and mystic in language; yet in all messages the same philosophy, the same religion, and the same mysticism lie below the surface.[297] To the Jews, Paul presents the "God of our Fathers," as at Antioch. To Gentiles he speaks of the "God of Creation," as he did at Athens. To Christians he stresses the will, word, and work of God, as he did at Miletus. This would mean for the Jew that God's promise of a deliverer had been realized. To the Gentile it would mean that God, the Creator and Ruler, called to repentance and warned of judgment. For the Christian, Jesus revealed the will of God fully. Yet Paul never deserts the original Hebrew idea of the one, true, eternal God.

As has been pointed out, Paul's act of communicating sprang out of the experience of his conversion, for at that time and ever afterward his conviction was that he must spread the truth of the Gospel everywhere. He took up where Jesus left off. Whatever else a comparison of Christ and Paul might yield, it shows that Christ's Gospel was continued and broadened by Paul to meet the needs of the world in which he found himself. Floyd Hamilton affirms, "Paul's theology was the theology Jesus taught, and the religious background of Paul's teaching was based on the teaching of Jesus Himself as recorded in the Gospels."[298]

To be sure some contrast Jesus and Paul, rather than compare them, charging Paul with speculation to a degree unwarranted, especially when one studies carefully the evidence that Luke presents in Acts as to how Paul was accustomed to preach. However, Peabody aptly points out: "The great words of character--Repentance, Forgiveness, Life, Peace--make the substance of the Gospels; the great words of dogma--Redemption, Election, Justification--make the reiterated teaching of the epistles. The Gospel of Paul begins where that of Jesus ends, with the story of the resurrection."[299] The resurrection is the starting point for understanding Paul's doctrine. He builds on the Jewish idea of the living God and finds its ultimate purpose and fulfillment in the new life in Christ in which the believer participates. Robertson and Scott both describe the heart of Paul's message as Christ as He was manifested through the resurrection: risen from the dead, living and glorified, proved by the same resurrection to be the Messiah of the Jews, the Son of God, the Means of Salvation.[300] All of these facts proclaimed the Lordship of Christ.

Deissman adds that Paul put special stress on the near approach of the completed Kingdom of God, with strong moral demands.[301] Scott states that there are two focal points in Paul's thinking: Christ's death as the condition of redemption in the fullest sense of the term, and the conviction of the new life in Christ.[302] Ropes offers a fuller explanation:

> The case is . . . that a thoroughly trained Jew, who had at his command both the theological resources of the rabbis of the first century and also the treasures of the Old Testament, and who knew something of the Greek world, whose language he spoke, was led by the spirit of God to believe that in Jesus Christ redemption had at last been brought to the whole world, and that through faith in Jesus Christ all men's cravings could now be fully satisfied.[303]

Rall interprets Paul's idea of the work of the Spirit as follows: "But when God comes with His grace and man answers with a repentant and believing 'Yes,' then they are joined; then God dwells in man by his Spirit and man shares in God's life and nature so far as the finite can share."[304]

James Stewart follows this line of thought: "The conviction has grown steadily upon me that union with Christ rather than . . . any of the other great apostolic themes, is the real clue to an understanding of Paul's thought and experience."[305] Paul always emphasized the new life of the convert to Christianity. For him it was the contrast of the spiritual life with the physical or "carnal," the deliverance of the spirit from the dominance of sense, giving it a lofty view of all higher virtue and of principles of freedom and love. He has described it well in Romans 8:1-17. Rall cites four aspects of the way Paul pictures the new life in union with Christ:

> 1. The Christian is one who is created again, and made over into a new being. II Corinthians 5:17; Galatians 6:15.

2. Christian experience is dying and being made alive. Romans 6:1-11; Colossians 2:13; Ephesians 2:1-5.

3. The Christian is one who is in union with Christ. Baptism is a spiritual experience, and one walks with Christ in a new life.

4. The indwelling and creating Spirit gives the believer a new mind and a new spirit. This is creative activity on God's part.[306]

It is vital to an understanding of Paul's preaching to understand him fully when he says, "It is no longer I that live, but Christ that lives in me. The life I am now living in the body I am living by faith in the Son of God Who loved me and gave Himself for me."[307] The union of Christ with the believer removes the veil from men's minds and spirits so that they can comprehend the glory of God shining in Jesus.[308]

Thus, the Gospel, which urges men to repent and believe, also gives them a way to live. God spoke through Paul to people on their own terms which could be clearly understood, and could be the means of improving life in a practical, down-to-earth manner. One can hardly find a mystical passage in Paul which does not include an ethical reference or implication. Though the Apostle gives much place to the idea of a communion with the Divine which is ultimate, dynamic, and life-transforming, the major part of his teaching is concerned not with matters of doctrine but with the concrete problems of human living, in relation to God and man. His doctrine rests on the concept that God is Love, as seen in Jesus Christ. This love wills only and always the highest good for its objects, and its power is sovereign for good. Ethics for Paul is the ethics of the Spirit of Christ. Christ-like love alone can solve the conflicts of human life, and lead us to our true purposes and destinies. The love of God calls us to give ourselves unselfishly to others. This Paul did.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Charles Norris Cochrane, Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 61.

[2] T. R. Glover, The World of the New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931), p. 111.

[3] Cochrane, p. 41.

[4] Glover, p. 109.

[5] Glover, p. 110.

[6] Glover, p. 114.

[7] Matthew 2, "King."

[8] Acts 12.

[9] Acts 23:24; 24:27.

[10] See Quo Vadis? (Whither Goest Thou?) by Henry K. Sienkiewcz, 1895, a story of Roman society under Nero.

[11] F. W. Farrar, Early Days of Christianity (London: Cassell, Petter Galpin & Co., 1899), ch. 29.

[12] John 7:35; Acts 2:10; James 1:1; I Peter 1:1.

[13] Richard Chenevix Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (London: Macmillan & Co., 1880), p. 14.

[14] It was the "Syrian language" mentioned in II Kings 18:26; Isaiah 36:11; and Daniel 2:4.

[15] John 19:20, 21; Acts 22:2 refer to it as "Hebrew"; instances of it are in Mark 7:34 and 15:34.

[16] Acts 21:37.

[17] Luke 23:38.

[18] Farrar, ch. 1; also 2, 3, and 4.

[19] Tacitus, "Germania," The Complete Works of Tacitus, trans. Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb (New York: The Modern Library, 1942), p. 42.

[20] Glover, p. 94.

[21] Arthur E. R. Boak, A History of Rome to A.D. 565 (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1955), p. 71.

[22] F. W. Farrar, Life and Work of Paul (London: Cassell & Company Ltd., 1908), p. 53.

[23] George P. Fisher, The Beginnings of Christianity, with a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ (London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1877), p. 123.

[24] Fisher, p. 124.

[25] John 18:38.

[26] In Hebrews 10:1 there is an echo of Plato's "ideas."

[27] The Basic Works of Cicero, ed. Moses Hadas (New York: Random House, 1951), p. xv.

[28] S. J. Conybeare and J. W. Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.), p. 296.

[29] John P. Mahaffy, The Silver Age of the Greek World (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1906), pp. 96, 97.

[30] W. M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949), p. 148.

[31] Walter Miller, Greece and the Greeks (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941), p. 180.

[32] Conybeare and Howson, p. 20.

[33] John 14:6.

[34] "Jewish Apocalyptic," Hibbert Journal (London: Oxford University Press, 1902-1936), 18, p. 104.

[35] W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, A History of Israel (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 402.

[36] See Daniel 9, and Haggai. Other books including such prophecies include Micah, Isaiah, Zephaniah, Ezekial, Zechariah and Joel.

[37] James Iverach, St. Paul, His Life and Times (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., n.d.), p. 40.

[38] Iverach, p. 204.

[39] Acts 1:8.

[40] Acts 8:1.

[41] Philippians 4:22.

[42] Cochrane, p. 225.

[43] Cochrane, p. 451.

[44] John 16:33.

[45] R. C. Jebb, The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus (London: Macmillan & Company, 1893), I, p. lxxi.

[46] Donald Lemen Clark, Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), pp. 64, 65.

[47] Clark, p. 263.

[48] Jebb, I, pp. lxxiii-lxxiv.

[49] Cicero De Oratore, trans. E. W. Sutton, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948), 1. 14, 17.

[50] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, trans. Harry Caplan, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), 1. 3; Cicero De Inventione, trans. H. M. Hubbel, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), 1. 9.

[51] Cicero De Oratore, 1. 145; Quintilian Institutio Oratoria, trans. H. E. Butler, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 3. 3. 4.

[52] II Corinthians 10:1-10.

[53] Rhetorica Ad Herennium 1. 4; Cicero De Inventione, 1. 19; cf. Cicero De Oratore, 1. 143.

[54] Aristotle, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, trans. Lane Cooper (New York: Appleton-Century, Inc., 1932), 1. 2.

[55] Cicero De Partitione Oratoria, trans. H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948), 2. 7.

[56] *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*, 3. 16; Cicero *De Oratore*, 2. 307.

[57] Quintilian, 3. 9. 1-3.

[58] Cicero *De Oratore*, 2. 79; cf. Cicero *De Partitione Oratoria*, 4, 27; Cicero, *Orator*, trans. H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 122; Cicero *Topica*, trans. H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), 97.

[59] Quintilian, 8. 1. 1.

[60] Cicero, *Orator*, 82; cf. Quintilian, 12. 10. 58.

[61] Cf. Quintilian, 9. 3, 55; 9. 4, 22; 9. 4, 61; 9. 4, 66; 9. 4. 123; 9. 4, 125; 12. 10, 51; 12. 10, 59; 12. 10, 60; 12. 60, 61; 12. 10, 67; 12. 10, 71.

[62] Cicero, *Orator*, 67. 227, 165, 212.

[63] Jebb, 1, 73.

[64] Cicero *De Oratore*, trans. J. S. Watson (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855), 3. 56.

[65] Quintilian, 2. 17. 31.

[66] Quintilian, 9. 3. 89.

[67] Quintilian, 11. 3. 182.

[68] Quintilian, 3. 57. 217.

[69] Cicero *De Oratore*, 3. 60. 225.

[70] Cicero *De Oratore*, 3. 61. 227; cf. Quintilian, 11. 3. 14, 15.

[71] Quintilian, 11. 3. 35.

[72] Quintilian, 11. 3. 112, 113.

[73] Quintilian, 11. 3. 116.

[74] Aristotle, 3. 14.

[75] Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory*, trans. J. W. Watson (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1903), 4. 1. 52.

[76] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, 1. 12ff; Cicero De Inventione, 1. 27; Quintilian, Institutes, 4. 2; Cicero De Partitione Oratoria, 31, 32; cf. also Rhetorica Ad Herennium, 1. 16; Cicero De Inventione, 1. 30.

[77] Clark, pp. 117, 118.

[78] Quintilian, Institutes, 5. 14. 27, 32.

[79] Cicero De Oratore, 11. 40.

[80] Aristotle, 2. 20.

[81] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, 3. 10-15; Cicero De Inventione, 2. 177, 78; Cicero De Partitione Oratoria, 70-82; Cicero De Oratore, 2. 340-49; Quintilian Institutio, 3. 7. 1-28.

[82] Cicero De Oratore, trans. Watson, 1. 31. 143.

[83] Cicero De Inventione, 1. 156. For Cicero's further views on the subject, see also De Partitione Oratoria, 83; Topica, 91; De Oratore, 2. 334. Cf. Quintilian, Institutio, 3. 8. 1.

[84] Cicero De Oratore, 1. 90.

[85] Cicero De Oratore, 2. 31. 133, 34.

[86] Cicero De Oratore, 14. 45, 46.

[87] Clark, p. 132.

[88] Lorenzo Sears, Orators of Ancient Rome, ed. Guy Carleton Lee and Joseph Cullen Ayer (New York: C. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901), 2:10.

[89] Cicero De Inventione, 3. 1. 1.

[90] Cicero De Oratore, 3. 34, 142, 3.

[91] Cicero De Oratore, 2. 8. 34.

[92] Cicero, Orator, 4. 14, 16.

[93] Ashley H. Thorndyke, ed., Modern Eloquence (New York: Modern Eloquence Corporation, 1928), 10:25.

[94] William A. Edward, The Suasoriae of Seneca The Elder (Cambridge: University Press, 1928), p. 19.

[95] Andrew Weaver, Gladys Borchers, and Donald Smith, The Teaching of Speech (New York: Macmillan Co., 1956), p. 24.

[96] Quintilian Institutio Oratoria, 1. 9.

[97] Harry Caplan, "The Decay of Eloquence at Rome in the First Century," Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1944), pp. 295-325.

[98] D. L. Clark, p. 214.

[99] Lawrence B. Goodrich, "Chrysostom, 'King of Preachers,'" The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 24 (1953), 27.

[100] J. W. Cohoon, Dio Chrysostom (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1932), 9:7.

[101] Everett Lee Hunt, "Plato on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VI, No. 3 (1920), 51.

[102] M. L. Clarke, Rhetoric at Rome, A Historical Survey (London: Cohen & West Ltd., 1968), p. 2.

[103] Plato Sophist, trans. H. N. Fowler (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928), pp. 343, 351, 403.

[104] Plato Phaedrus, trans. H. N. Fowler (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 517.

[105] Plato Phaedrus, pp. 517, 519.

[106] Plato Phaedrus, p. 523.

[107] Jebb, 2. 442.

[108] Lester Thonssen and Craig A. Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press, 1948), p. 98.

[109] Charles Sears Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959), p. 71.

[110] Lucian, The Sham Sophist or the Solecist, trans. M. D. MacLeod, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), IV, 155-159.

[111] D. L. Clark, pp. 216, 217.

[112] Tacitus, The Complete Works of Tacitus, ed. Moses Hadas (New York: Random House, 1942), p. 735.

[113] Baldwin, Medieval Rhetoric, p. 7.

[114] Baldwin, Medieval Rhetoric, p. viii.

[115] James Stalker, The Life of St. Paul (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, n.d.), p. 93.

[116] Howard Tillman Kuist, The Pedagogy of St. Paul (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1925), p. 151.

[117] Sir Wm. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896), p. 134.

[118] C. E. Jefferson, The Character of Paul (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923), p. 375.

[119] Acts 18:12, 13.

[120] Acts 14:1.

[121] Acts 17:4. See also Acts 13:43, and Acts 26:28.

[122] Acts 17:6.

[123] Stalker, p. 14, 15.

[124] Stalker, p. 15.

[125] Henry Hart Milman, The History of Christianity (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1841), p. 379.

[126] George P. Fisher, History of the Christian Church (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1887), p. 30.

[127] Samuel Sandmel, A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament (Cincinnati: The Hebrew Union College Press, 1956), p. 44.

[128] Sandmel, pp. 44, 45.

[129] Sandmel, p. 48.

[130] Sandmel, p. 51.

[131] Acts 23:6.

[132] Acts 26:5.

[133] II Corinthians 11:22.

[134] David Smith, The Life and Letters of St. Paul (New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.), p. 21.

[135] Acts 23:16-22.

[136] For further discussion, see W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, p. 45; Martin Dibelius, Paul, trans. Frank Clarke, ed., W. G. Kummel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), p. 16; W. M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949), p. 31; and F. W. Farrar, Life and Letters of St. Paul (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, n.d.), I, 42.

[137] Acts 22:25-29; Acts 25:11, 16.

[138] See Ephesians 5:22-33; 6:1-4, and Colossians, Chap. 3.

[139] F. H. Smith, Education in Ancient Israel from Earliest Times to A.D. 70, cited by Howard T. Kuist, The Pedagogy of St. Paul, p. 31.

[140] Kuist, p. 33.

[141] Tacitus, p. 757.

[142] Morton Scott Enslin, The Ethics of Paul (New York: Harpers, 1930), p. 191.

[143] S. S. Laurie, Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education, p. 66, cited by Kuist, p. 24.

[144] G. Stanley Hall, Jesus the Christ, in the Light of Psychology (New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1917), I, 324.

[145] Gerald M. Phillips, "The Practice of Rhetoric at Talmudic Academies," Speech Monographs, XXVI (March, 1959), p. 37.

[146] Phillips, p. 37.

[147] Phillips, pp. 37, 38.

[148] Phillips, pp. 38, 39.

[149] Galatians 4:21-31.

[150] Galatians 3:16.

[151] Phillips, p. 39.

[152] Phillips, p. 46.

[153] See Acts 5:34-39.

[154] Stalker, p. 29.

[155] Acts 21:39.

[156] David Smith, p. 18.

[157] Smith, pp. 18, 19.

[158] Acts 22:3.

[159] T. Harwood Pattison, The History of Christian Preaching (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1909), pp. 41, 42.

[160] Mary Larrimer, The Life of Paul of Tarsus (Boston: Lothrop, Lee and Shepard Co., 1929), p. 15.

[161] Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949), p. 234.

[162] Mahaffy, p. 86.

[163] F. W. Farrar, Life and Letters of St. Paul, pp. 22, 23.

[164] Arthur Cushman McGiffert, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), pp. 114, 115.

[165] Acts 9:29.

[166] Acts 21:37.

[167] Acts 21:40; Acts 22:1-3.

[168] James Hardy Ropes, The Apostolic Age in the Light of Modern Criticism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), pp. 123, 124.

[169] W. M. Ramsay, The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913), p. 82.

[170] T. R. Glover, pp. 5, 6.

[171] Robert S. Kinsey, With Paul in Greece (Nashville, Tennessee: The Parthenon Press, 1957), pp. 10, 158.

[172] I Corinthians 12:14-26.

[173] Xenophon, Memorabilia, trans. E. C. Marchant, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), II, 3, 18.

[174] Livy, From the Founding of the City, trans. Alfred C. Schlesinger, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), II, 32.

[175] See Acts 16:37, 39; Acts 22:25-29; Acts 23:28.

[176] William A. Quayle, The Pastor-Preacher (Cincinnati: Jennings and Graham; New York: Eaton and Mains, 1910), pp. 293, 294.

[177] Ramsay, The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day, p. 12.

[178] For Paul's vivid description of the results of such darkness, see Romans 1:22-32.

[179] H. V. Morton, In the Steps of St. Paul (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1937), p. 102.

[180] James Hastings, ed., Dictionary of the Bible (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909), p. 691.

[181] Martin Dibelius, p. 28.

[182] Amos N. Wilder, Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospels (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 38, 39.

[183] II Corinthians 4:7.

[184] Tacitus, p. 740.

[185] T. R. Glover, Paul of Tarsus (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1925), p. 210.

[186] Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, pp. 21, 22.

[187] Acts 13:9; Acts 14:9; and Acts 23:1.

[188] Glover, Paul of Tarsus, p. 209.

[189] Acts 20:34.

[190] Acts 13:16 and Acts 21:40.

[191] Acts 26:1.

[192] II Corinthians 11:23-27.

[193] Ezra S. Tipple, Francis Asbury, the Prophet of the Long Road (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1916), p. 235.

[194] See Conybeare and Howson, p. 482.

[195] H. V. Morton, p. 105; see also I Corinthians 2:3, II Corinthians 11:27.

[196] II Corinthians 12:7-9.

[197] Edersheim, Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ, p. 89, quoted by Kuist, p. 22.

[198] Kuist, p. 22.

[199] Alfred E. Garvie, former principal of Hackney and New College, University of London.

[200] Ramsay, The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day, p. 47.

[201] See Acts, Chap. 17.

[202] Acts 14:6-22.

[203] Philippians 1:20, 21.

[204] II Timothy 1:7.

[205] See Romans 15:20, 21.

[206] Galatians 2:11-21.

[207] Acts 17:24, 25.

[208] Acts 14:15ff.

[209] Acts 15:1ff.

[210] Acts 19:1ff.

[211] I Corinthians 8.

[212] Romans 13:1ff.

[213] Philippians 1:17ff.

[214] Galatians 1:8, 9; I Corinthians 16:22.

[215] Romans 1:1 and Philippians 1:1.

[216] Galatians 1:8-10.

[217] Romans 9:1-3.

[218] Romans 10:1.

[219] Charles Edward Jefferson, The Character of Paul, pp. 1-375; see also H. T. Kuist, The Pedagogy of St. Paul, pp. 92-93; and W. C. Wilkinson, Paul and the Revolt Against Him (Boston: The Griffith and Rowland Press, 1914), pp. 8-46.

[220] McGiffert, pp. 114, 116, 121.

[221] T. R. Glover, The Mind of St. Paul (London: Humphrey Milford Amen House, E. D., 1941), p. 11.

[222] I Corinthians 7:7, 8.

[223] Martin Dibelius, p. 41.

[224] Acts 7:60.

[225] Charles Archibald Anderson Scott, St. Paul, the Man and the Teacher (Cambridge: The University Press, 1936), p. 13.

[226] George Baker Stevens, Theology of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 329.

[227] R. J. Knowling, The Testimony of Paul to Christ (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911), p. 179. See also Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen, p. 379.

[228] Acts 26:15-18.

[229] Acts 22:14.

[230] John McClintock and James Strong, "Paul," Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1877), VII:4.

[231] Maurice Jones, St. Paul, the Orator (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910), pp. 258ff.

[232] William Ramsay, Historical Commentary on Galatians (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913), p. 272.

[233] McGiffert, p. 147.

[234] McGiffert, p. 121.

[235] Charles H. Dodd, The Meaning of St. Paul for Today (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1920), p. 75.

[236] Acts 9:21; see also Thomas Lewin, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul (London: Rivington's, 1851), p. 73.

[237] Sandmel, p. 44.

[238] See I Corinthians 14:47-49; Romans 4:15ff; and I Corinthians 6:17.

[239] McGiffert, p. 131.

[240] Greek translation, "Creation"; see II Corinthians 5:17.

[241] Archibald Thomas Robertson, The Glory of the Ministry (New York; Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1911), pp. 87, 106.

[242] Robertson, p. 106.

[243] Stevens, p. 328.

[244] Romans 7:7-25.

[245] C. H. Dodd, New Testament Studies (Manchester: The Manchester University Press, 1953), p. 78.

[246] Romans 7:23.

[247] Romans 7:21.

[248] Dodd, New Testament Studies, p. 78.

[249] See Philippians 3:7..

[250] Dodd, New Testament Studies, p. 78; see also Galatians 2:19; 3:13.

[251] Galatians 3:13; I Corinthians 9:21.

[252] See Romans 7:7ff; also, McGiffert, p. 122.

[253] McGifferts, p. 126 fn.

[254] Martin Dibelius, p. 46.

[255] I Timothy 1:15.

[256] Stevens, p. 336.

[257] John Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950), p. 113.

[258] Robertson, p. 87.

[259] Acts 26:19.

[260] I Corinthians 9:1; 15:8; and Galatians 1:11-17.

[261] See Acts 22:14-16; Acts 26:16-19.

[262] See II Corinthians 6:16; 13:5, 6; Galatians 2:20.

[263] Acts 22:10.

[264] Philippians 3:10.

[265] Pattison, p. 38.

[266] George S. Duncan, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929), p. 133.

[267] Richard Holt Hutton, "M. Renan's St. Paul," Theological Essays (New York: Macmillan and Company, 1888), p. 322.

[268] Galatians 1:15-17.

[269] Acts 9:23.

[270] II Corinthians 11:23-29.

[271] I Corinthians 15:19.

[272] II Corinthians 4:18.

[273] Philippians 3:14.

[274] I Corinthians 15:12-14.

[275] I Corinthians 15:6.

[276] Romans 3:23.

[277] Romans 6:23.

[278] Galatians 4:4, 5.

[279] Acts 16:31.

[280] C. H. Dodd, "The Epistle of Paul to the Romans," Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York: Harper &

Brothers, 1932), p. 18.

[281] Romans 3:24.

[282] Dodd, "The Epistle of Paul to the Romans," pp. 18, 19.

[283] Acts 26:19, 20; Acts 20:21.

[284] Romans 10:9, 10; Acts 17:30, 31.

[285] Galatians 3:13; cf. Deuteronomy 21:23.

[286] II Corinthians 5:21.

[287] Stalker, p. 116.

[288] W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, p. 47.

[289] Acts 28:23.

[290] Carl von Weizsacker, The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, trans. James Miller (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1897), I:131.

[291] Romans 1:2; I Corinthians 15:3, 4.

[292] C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul (Cambridge: The University Press, 1957), p. 8.

[293] Martin Luther, Table Talk, trans. William Hazlitt (Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication Society, 1911), #425, p. 238.

[294] II Thessalonians, Chap. 2; Luther, p. 230.

[295] McGiffert, p. 259.

[296] Maurice Jones, p. 283.

[297] Ramsay, The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day, p. 9.

[298] Floyd Hamilton, The Basis of Christian Faith (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1927), p. 160.

[299] Francis G. Peabody, The Apostle Paul and the Modern World (New York: Macmillan Company, 1953), p. 10.

[300] For Scriptural basis, see Acts 9:20, 22; Galatians 1:17; Ephesians 4:20; Acts 11:20; I Thessalonians 1:8; Galatians 1:16; II Thessalonians 3:1; Romans 1:4; and also

Acts 17:18; Acts 9:20, 22.

[301] Adolf Deissman, St. Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. Lionel P. M. Strachan (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1912), p. 217.

[302] C. A. A. Scott, "Jesus and Paul," Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day, ed. Henry Barclay Swete (London: Macmillan and Company, 1927), p. 355.

[303] Ropes, p. 137.

[304] H. F. Rall, According to Paul (New York: Charles Scirner's Sons, 1945), p. 131.

[305] James Stewart, A Man in Christ (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), p. vii.

[306] H. F. Rall, p. 131.

[307] Galatians 2:19, 20.

[308] II Corinthians 3:7-18; II Corinthians 4:3-6; Romans 6:5; Romans 8:29; Romans 12:2; Philippians 3:10.

CHAPTER III

THE RHETORIC OF SAINT PAUL IN ACTS 13

Werner Jaeger, in Early Christianity and Greek Paideia, points out the fact that Christianity did not stop at the Dead Sea or at the border of Judaea, but rather penetrated the surrounding world which was dominated and unified by Greek civilization and language. As has been noted, without the three preceding centuries of worldwide expansion of Greek civilization, Christianity could not have developed, expanded, and finally risen as a world religion. Further, along with the Christianization of the Greek-speaking world within the Roman Empire, the Hellenization of the Christian religion resulted. The first stage of Christian Hellenism was the use of the Greek language, through which Greek concepts, modes of thinking, and metaphores entered Christian thought.

Christianity could be rapidly assimilated because it was a Jewish movement and the Jews were Hellenized by the time of Paul. Further, it was to the Hellenized Jews that Paul turned first.[1] Acts 13 records the initial stages of Paul's first evangelistic tour. He sailed first to the island of Cyprus, proclaimed the word of God,[2] then headed north across 180 miles of water to the southern coast of Asia Minor.

It was probably late summer or early autumn in A.D. 46[3] when he docked at the port city of Perga in Pamphylia, then continued on to the inland city of Pisidian Antioch.[4] There, in the familiar surroundings of a Jewish synagogue, Paul preached his first recorded sermon.

The Historical Setting

The Synagogue

When the Sabbath came, the newly-arrived Apostle, with his companion, Barnabas, made his way to the synagogue. On entering, both missionaries went to the section reserved for the men, took seats appropriate to their age, and joined the rest of the congregation in worship. The synagogue sanctuary was "a double enclosure, one portion set apart for the use of men, the other for the women."[5] Seating was arranged with the elders in the front and the younger in the back.[6] Evidently Paul and Barnabas did not go to the "chief seats" which faced the rest of the congregation and were reserved for persons of rank and dignity in the Jewish community. Luke notes that the invitation had to be "sent to them," suggesting that they had taken their seats in the audience with the people. This act of modesty and humility probably impressed the audience[7] and made them receptive to what Paul was going to say. It was after the reading of the Law and the Prophets[8] that the rulers of the synagogue sent a message to the two newcomers inviting them to speak a "word of exhortation" to the people. The expression, "word of exhortation," was probably a technical phrase used in the synagogue to refer to the sermon which followed the Scripture reading.[9]

The invitation of the rulers was not at all unusual, for the synagogue sermon was not delivered by one particular rabbi, but could be given by any competent member of the congregation. All that was required was that the individual be of "especial proficiency."[10]

It is unlikely, however, that the rulers would have invited just any chance strangers to speak in public. Somehow they must have known that the Apostles were qualified to preach in the synagogue. Perhaps Paul and Barnabas had introduced themselves to the rulers earlier in the week and had asked for the privilege of addressing the congregation that Sabbath. Or maybe their preaching of a new doctrine in the streets and markets of Pisidian Antioch the past few days had attracted the attention of the rulers. Whatever the case, the rulers were certainly aware that the Apostles had something they wanted to say. The invitation to Paul and Barnabas--"If you have any word of exhortation for the people, say it" (Acts 13:15)--expresses a first-class condition, one which is assumed to be true.[11]

The Audience

The synagogue audience approached the Sabbath service with reverence and anticipation. The worshippers came that Sabbath as they came every Sabbath--to thoroughly learn the will of God so that they might not sin against Him.[12] They came to sit quietly and to listen attentively to a message which would "make the whole of life grow into something better."[13] The Jews "often lived in a separate quarter of the town in which they had received formal permission to settle. The reason for this was not compulsion, but a desire for close union and companionship."[14] For the past few days the Jewish quarter had probably been buzzing with the teaching of the two strangers, and it may have been anticipated that they would attend the synagogue and perhaps be called on for the sermon of the day. Now the Jews waited for Paul to speak.

This briefly is the historical setting of Paul's first sermon. He has been asked to speak by the rulers of the synagogue and the audience is apparently favorably disposed to listen.

The Biblical Exposition

The Text of the Sermon

When the invitation to speak was given, Paul stood and went to the speaker's platform. After motioning with his hand, he began. The nature of this gesture is not too clear. Ricciotti thinks that it was "the gesture habitual with Pagan orators at the beginning of a speech";[15] Carter and Earl describe it as "a familiar gesture designed to arrest attention and establish rapport with his audience."[16]

Paul sought to establish rapport with his opening words, also:

> Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience. The God of this people of Israel chose our fathers, and exalted the people when they dwelt as strangers in the land of Egypt, and with an high arm brought he them out of it.
>
> And about the time of forty years suffered he their manners in the wilderness. And when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Chanaan, he divided their land to them by lot.
>
> And after that he gave unto them judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet.
>
> And afterward they desired a king; and God gave unto them Saul the son of Cis, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, by the space of forty years.
>
> And when he had removed him, he raised up unto them David to be their king; to whom also he gave testimony, and said, I have found David the son of Jesse a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfill all my will.
>
> Of this man's seed hath God according to his promise raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus:
>
> When John had first preached before his coming the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel. And as John fulfilled his course, he said, Whom think ye that I am? I am not he. But, behold, there cometh one after me, whose shoes of his feet I am not worthy to loose.
>
> Men and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and whosoever among you feareth God, to you is the word of this salvation sent.
>
> For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him.
>
> And though they found no cause of death in him, yet desired they Pilate that he should be slain. And

> they took him down from the tree, and laid him in a sepulchre.
>
> But God raised him from the dead.
>
> And he was seen many days of them which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people.
>
> And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers.
>
> God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.
>
> And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David.
>
> Wherefore he saith also in another psalm, Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.
>
> For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption:
>
> But he, whom God raised again, saw no corruption.
>
> Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins:
>
> And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.
>
> Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets:
>
> Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish, for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you.

The Content and Organization of the Sermon

Before Paul's sermon can be rhetorically analyzed, its content and organization must be thoroughly understood.

This means that the sermon's theme and purpose need to be determined--what is Paul trying to say? What is he trying to accomplish? The point-by-point development of the message must be traced in detail--how does the thought progress? What are the reasoning processes? What is the proper interpretation of the words? These are matters of Biblical exposition as well as a necessary foundation to the rhetorical analysis.

The Theme and Purpose of the Sermon.--The theme of Paul's sermon is a clear and precise statement that sums up everything he has to say--that God has taken the initiative and has, in line with the appropriate promises, brought the long-awaited Savior to Israel in the person of Jesus. This key sentence occurs early in the message and is Paul's way of synthesizing his entire discourse. Paul's purpose in preaching this theme is to persuade his audience to believe in Jesus as Savior so that they might be forgiven and justified. This concern is strongly expressed in the closing section of the message. Paul is not satisfied that his audience merely recognize his thematic statement and understand that God has brought Jesus to Israel. He wants his listeners to accept this God-given Savior as their own so that they might obtain forgiveness of sins and justification from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law. In short, Paul's purpose is to persuade his audience to act on his theme.[17]

The Structure and Outline of the Sermon.--The structure of Paul's sermon follows a pattern of introduction, statement of theme, arrangement and development of ideas, and conclusion. The theme is the central factor; the other three parts relate to it; the introduction leads up to the theme, the body develops it, and the conclusion applies it to the audience.

Paul begins with a recital of some of God's past great works on Israel's behalf--the exodus, the conquest, the theocracy. This moves him naturally into the statement of his theme which is that in this present day, God has done the greatest of all works for Israel--He has provided a Savior.

The body of Paul's sermon shows that God's provision of a Savior has been "according to promise." Specifically, God has fulfilled these promises: that He would prepare the nation for the Savior's coming, that the Savior would have omnipotent power and that the Savior would live forever.

The conclusion of the sermon is in two parts: application and exhortation. In the application, Paul stresses the practical consequences that come from having a powerful and eternal Savior. In the exhortation, he urges his audience to respond with belief in Jesus lest they be guilty of turning their backs on the greatest work that God has ever done for Israel.

This overall structure can be put in outline form as follows:

Introduction

I. Remember how God has been delivering Israel since the beginning of her history.

II. Remember how God has used individuals to deliver Israel.

III. Remember how God will climax His deliverance of Israel through David and his seed.

Theme

God, according to promise, has brought to Israel a Savior, Jesus.

Arrangement and development of ideas

I. God has fulfilled His promise to prepare the nation for the Savior's coming.

II. God has fulfilled His promise to provide the nation with a powerful Savior.

III. God has fulfilled His promise to provide the nation with an eternal Savior.

Conclusion

I. Through Jesus as Savior there is forgiveness of sins and justification from all things.

II. Be diligent to believe this greatest work that God has done for Israel.

The outline reveals the continual interplay of the five key words of Paul's theme: God, promise, Israel, Savior, Jesus. This interplay will become even more apparent as each major part of the sermon is now developed in detail.

Arrangement and Development of Ideas with Emphasis upon Logos

Paul begins his sermon by stirring up memories of what God has done for "this people Israel": In this introduction he leads up to his theme in three distinct steps, each one building on the one preceding. He first reminds the audience that God has been delivering Israel since the beginning of her history. Then he points out that this continuing deliverance has often been brought about by specific God-given individuals. Finally, he draws attention to God's promise that the climax of this deliverance will be through another specific individual who will be of the seed of David. Through these three introductory steps, Paul builds to the statement of his theme--that God has now climaxed this continuing deliverance by bringing forth Jesus as Israel's Savior. This introduction will now be developed in detail.

In order to remind his audience that God has been delivering Israel throughout her history, Paul carefully selects and recounts those events in the nation's past in which God actively redeemed His people. Those events were the choice of the fathers, the deliverance from Egypt, and the gift of the land. "Redeemed" is here understood in the broad sense of being freed from some evil, whether that evil be anonymity (the choice of the fathers), slavery (the deliverance from Egypt), or homelessness (the gift of the land).[18]

Up to this point Paul's historical review has followed a pattern that is very familiar to his audience.[19] It is a tactfully planned pattern which tends to make his own character look virtuous, competent in knowledge and use of the Scripture, and of sincere goodwill, thereby putting the audience in the right frame of mind.

Now the Apostle makes a slight and deliberate shift. While continuing chronologically, he moves to the second step of his introduction and mentions individuals God gave to the nation to "save" them. The judges were specifically raised up to save the nation from its oppressors.[20] Later, when the people asked for a king, God gave them Saul to save them by fighting their battles.[21] Then David was destined to deliver Israel by saving her from all her enemies.[22] All of these individuals were "saviors" in the limited sense of the word.

Once David's name is mentioned, the Apostle Paul can immediately refer to God's testimony that He intends to climax His deliverance of Israel through David. The syllogistic reasoning is as follows: David will do all of God's will; it has been demonstrated that God's will is to save Israel; therefore, God will somehow climax His saving of Israel through David.

As Paul cites this testimony concerning David, both he and his audience understand that the testimony really concerns a future son of David rather than David himself. It was commonly understood that David would "do all of God's will" in the sense that he would give birth to a greater son who would fully do God's will as Israel's Messianic Redeemer. This understanding will be substantiated in a later section. Paul's quote would quickly remind his audience of a host of Old Testament passages which promised that God would raise up a Davidic son who would offer justice, righteousness and salvation to the nation.[23]

At this point in his sermon there is only one statement that Paul can make that will satisfy the religious feelings he has kindled in his introduction. He has spoken of God's deliverance through events and through divinely-given men, and of God's promise to climax this deliverance through a son of David. Now he unites these ideas into the single concept which become his theme: "of this man's (David's) seed, God, according to promise, has brought to Israel a Savior, Jesus."

Once his theme is stated, Paul immediately begins to develop it by picking up on the phrase, "according to promise." Moving into the body of his sermon, he expands this phrase to show that in bringing Jesus to Israel, God has done everything that He promised He would do. With primary interest now focused upon these ideas, we can ask, "How does the Apostle develop them?" "How does he argue his case?"

The first main point in the development of Paul's sermon is that God has fulfilled His promise to prepare the nation for the Savior's coming. The Old Testament promised that a forerunner would prepare the nation in two ways: By turning the people toward righteousness,[24] bringing them to a recognition of their need; and by publicly announcing the imminent coming of the Savior,[25] so that they would receive Him.

Paul now declares that God has fulfilled these promises in John the Baptist. John was sent to "make ready for the Lord a people prepared,"[26] and he fulfilled his task of turning the nation toward righteousness by heralding a "baptism of repentance." The key word in his preaching was "repent," as he demanded of his listeners that they "bring forth fruits meet for repentance."[27] Furthermore, John's call for repentance did prepare the nation, for people from many walks of life flocked to hear him and to indicate their hunger for righteousness through his baptism. The gospel accounts reveal that religious leaders, common people, tax-collectors, and soldiers thronged John the Baptist to confess their sins and be washed in the Jordan.[28] John also prepared the people to begin looking for the Savior, saying One would soon come, Whose very shoes the Baptist was not fit to unloose.

Paul concludes his first main point with the glad reminder that he and his audience are part of the nation that God has so specially and earnestly prepared. "To you is the word of this salvation sent."[29] You are the ones, Paul affirms, who have been prepared for the Savior's coming. The suggestion is that having been prepared, they should now receive Him. All of this might seem to have been good news to the audience. However, at this point Paul appears to recognize that they may be bothered by the fact that Jesus was condemned to death by the Jews in Jerusalem. How can Jesus be the Savior when the rulers condemned Him as a blasphemous imposter? Further, the Old Testament taught that when the Davidic Savior came he would possess all power to save. How then can Jesus, who was put to death on a cross and buried in a tomb, be the Savior?[30] Paul doubtless realizes that unless he provides answers to these two questions his listeners will have serious reservations about the message he is preaching. He must somehow explain how the nation's spiritual leaders could condemn the Savior to death, and he must show how Jesus, who was evidently powerless to save himself, could have the power to save others. The answers to these questions form the second main point of his sermon.

The first question is the most difficult one to answer because of its emotional overtones. On the one hand, the audience must have a high view of the integrity and spirituality of their rulers. On the other hand, incompatibly, Paul's message suggests that these leaders committed a crime. It is inconceivable that the supposedly most spiritual men in Judaism would condemn the Savior to death. The audience would probably rather reject Paul's message than accept such a monstrous alternative.

This emotional conflict presents Paul with a dilemma.

If he bluntly insists on the full guilt of the leaders, he will probably alienate his audience. And yet, he cannot ignore the fact that these rulers did indeed reject and condemn the long-awaited Savior. Somehow he must affirm the truth without antagonizing his listeners.

Paul's solution to the problem is to put the rulers' awful act in the best possible light. His first answer is that it was only because the rulers did not know the voices of the prophets and did not recognize Who Jesus was that they condemned Him. The Apostle further tempers the infamy of the crime by pointing out that it was done in accordance with the eternal plan of God. They were carrying out "all that was written" of how the Savior would be rejected and put to death.[31] Thus Paul answers the question in such a way that his audience can accept the fact that Jesus is the Savior even though the rulers did condemn Him. It should be noticed that in answering this objection Paul has also managed to subtly add to his characterization of the Savior through the statement that "they could find no cause of death in Him." The sinlessness of Jesus makes it possible for Him to be a Savior Who can forgive the sins of others.

Next the Apostle deals with the question concerning the powerlessness of a dead man. Even though the slaying of Jesus was an unfortunate mistake, still, in the speaker's own words, "they took him down from the tree and laid him in a sepulchre." Jesus, being dead, is totally without power to be the Savior.

Paul answers this second objection in two parts: first, by proclaiming that God has raised Jesus from the dead, and second, by declaring that God has granted all power to Him.

> But God raised him from the dead;
>
> And he was seen many days of them which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people.
>
> And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.[32]

The second Psalm, which the Apostle quotes here, describes great hostility directed at the Christ. This hostility will be followed by His exaltation to power.

> The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying,
>
> Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.
>
> He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. (Saying) Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.
>
> I will declare the decree; the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.[33]

The Jews readily accepted this Psalm as Messianic, and applied it in their literature to the opposition to, and attacks upon, the Davidic son.[34] Paul's argument is a careful reasoning from Scripture, especially from this Psalm.

The Scriptures, he points out, clearly teach that the Savior will be a son of David. They also teach that this Davidic son will be God's son.[35] Furthermore, they teach that this Son will become the Savior in the fullest sense at a particular point in his life. That point will be after civil and religious leaders have attempted to destroy Him. Then God will bring Him forth as His Own Son in the fullest sense and He will be granted all power to save. By quoting Psalm 2:7, Paul suggests to his audience that the entire prophetic sequence has been fulfilled in Jesus. The New Testament authors "often quoted a single phrase or sentence not merely for its own sake, but as a pointer to a whole context--a practice by no means uncommon among contemporary Jewish teachers, as they are reported in the rabbinic literature."[36]

Thus Paul has skillfully come full-circle back to his theme that "God, according to promise, has brought to Israel a Savior, Jesus." He dialectically has taken two objections to his message, and has shown them to be the very means by which God has fulfilled His promise to bring forth a Davidic son with power. The rejection by the rulers and the subsequent death of Jesus were necessary prerequisites to His being exalted. It was through these seemingly negative events that God was able to fulfill His promise to provide the nation with a powerful Savior. With this, Paul has come to the end of the second main point of his systematically organized sermon.

The third point is necessary to round out Paul's message. It is not enough just to demonstrate that Jesus has the power to save. Paul must further affirm that this power is an eternal power, that the salvation being offered is an eternally secure salvation because Jesus is an eternally living Savior.

God had covenanted with David that He would have a son who would endure "forever."[37] Years later, after the fall of the Davidic dynasty, God reaffirmed His covenant, and promised that He would yet give to the nation "the mercies of David which are sure." This phrase, or "the holy blessings of David which are sure," has been variously interpreted. The preferable view, it would seem, is that Paul understands this phrase as an equivalent expression for "the eternal Davidic son." Several factors support this: First of all, the context of Isaiah 55:1-5 from which Paul quotes, speaks of Salvation, an everlasting covenant, and a Holy One given to Israel--phrases which suggest that the eternal Savior covenanted to David is the One in view. Second, the words "mercies" and "sure" were continually associated in the Old Testament with the covenant promises of an eternal son.[38] Finally, Paul's listeners themselves accepted the plural expression "holy blessings" as a name for an individual.[39] According to Paul, God has given the "holy blessings" to Israel in that Jesus has come as the Davidic Savior Who will live forever.

Paul then explains the fulfillment of God's second promise to David that He would not let His Holy One experience decay.[40] The Apostle's reasoning is as follows: This promise either applied to David or it applied to another. It did not apply to David, for when David had served the will of God in his generation, he fell asleep, and was laid with his fathers, and experienced decay. But Jesus, Whom God raised from the dead did not experience decay. Therefore, the promise applied to Jesus, and was fulfilled by His resurrection from the dead. He is the unsullied and immortal Holy One.

It should not go unnoticed that Paul, in explaining the fulfillment of this promise, has again managed to subtly add to his characterization of the Savior. His words concerning how David "served the will of God in his own generation" suggest a contrast between the finite David who served God in his own generation, and the eternal Savior who will accomplish the saving will of God throughout all generations. This Savior is the "holy" One.

This concludes the body of Paul's sermon. In three main points he has expanded his theme that God has acted "according to promise" in bringing Jesus to Israel as the Savior. Specifically, God has fulfilled His promises to prepare the nation for the Savior's coming, and to provide the nation with a Savior Who is both powerful and eternal.

Paul now concludes his sermon with an application and an exhortation.

In the application, Paul emphasizes that because Jesus is a powerful Savior, He can forgive sins; because Jesus is an eternal Savior He can justify from all things. The salvation that was begun in the choice of the fathers, continued through God-given individuals, and anticipated in the Davidic son, has now reached its climax in Jesus. In the forgiveness of sins, "the supreme expectation of the Old Testament is fulfilled."[41]

The Apostle's final words are an exhortation to believe in Jesus, and not reject or scorn this gospel:

> Take care, therefore, that there does not happen what is spoken of in the prophets: Behold ye despisers, and wonder, and perish: for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you.[42]

Some writers interpret Paul's final words as a bitter warning rather than as an honest encouragement. They suggest that Paul observed "symptoms of dissent or disapprobation on the countenance of his hearers" which meant that they were rejecting his message.[43] But the response to Paul's sermon is so entirely favorable that the idea of his threatening his audience because he sees them scowling is not easily accepted. Paul is, of course, concerned in the last few moments of his sermon, lest his audience respond to this, God's greatest work, as another generation responded to a previous work of God. The Apostle views the present situation as analogous to that in the opening chapter of Habakkuk, which he quotes. There the prophet asked God what

He intended to do about the injustice and violence in the land. God's answer was that He was doing a work in Habakkuk's day which both he and the people would not believe even if God explained it to them. God then proceeded to explain the work--He was going to use the Chaldeans to deal with Israel's sins--and, as predicted, the response was one of unbelief.[44]

Paul concludes his sermon by seeking to persuade his audience to immediately believe what God has done.

In summary, Paul's sermon begins with a review of the saving acts of God by which He brought the nation into existence, delivered them through divinely-given individuals, and promised to climax this deliverance through a Davidic son. The sermon's theme is that God, according to promise, has brought Jesus to Israel as the Davidic Savior. Paul then explains that because God's holy Son, Jesus, was sacrificed, and because God raised Him from the dead, Jesus is able to forgive sins and justify all who believe. This is the great climaxing work of God in delivering Israel, and the audience is exhorted to respond to it by believing in Jesus.

The Rhetorical Analysis

The Response to the Sermon

According to one ancient manuscript, the response to Paul's sermon was a deep silence.[45] All the accounts agree that the message had a profound and lasting effect on the audience:

> And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next sabbath.
>
> Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas; who, speaking to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God.[46]

What was there in Paul's preaching that produced such a response? What made his sermon so effective? Why was Paul so persuasive? These are the questions that must now be answered in the rhetorical analysis.

Paul's effectiveness was due largely to the choices he made. His success, humanly speaking, may be attributed to the fact that every aspect of his preaching was deliberately chosen because of its appropriateness to the particular audience to whom he was speaking. Specifically, Paul was persuasive because he picked a main idea, arrangement, style, pathos, and ethos that were suitable to the synagogue worshippers of Pisidian Antioch.

The Appropriateness of the Theme to the Occasion and Audience

Is the central theme of this speech particularly accommodated to the audience situation?

The theme of Paul's sermon, as has been noted, is that God, according to promise, has brought to Israel a Savior, Jesus. While Paul conceivably could have preached on any subject, he chose this particular theme because of its appropriateness to both the occasion and the audience.

The Appropriateness of the Theme to the Occasion.--Paul's theme was appropriate to the occasion because it corresponded with the Scripture passages that were read in the synagogue that sabbath.

The reading from the Law and the Prophets was a standard feature of synagogue worship.[47] These readings were not haphazardly selected, but were assigned weekly through the use of "lectionaries," or lists of passages. The lectionaries divided the pentateuchal books into 54, 154, and 175 sections so that the entire Law would be read through in one, three, or three and one-half year cycles.[48] This also made it possible for a speaker to know in advance the *seder* reading of any given sabbath. *Seder*--(plural, sedarim)--is the name given to the passage read from the Law, while *haphtarah*--(plural, *haphtaroth*)--is the section from the Prophets. In the Hebrew Bible the Prophets include most of what we would call the historical books as well as the major and minor Prophets.

While the *sedarim* were relatively fixed because of their consecutive nature, considerable flexibility was allowed in the choosing of the *haphtaroth*. The ruler of the synagogue, or the reader, was free to pick any passage as long as it were appropriate to the *seder* for the day.[49] In time, of course, certain *haphtaroth* became commonly associated with particular *sedarim*, but alternatives continued to exist and substitutions were allowed.

Though Luke does not specify the particular seder and haphtarah read in Pisidian Antioch that Sabbath, a glance at the lectionaries and a careful reading of Paul's sermon suggests several likely possibilities.[50] One commonly accepted suggestion is that the readings that Sabbath were from Deuteronomy 1 and Isaiah 1.[51] The arguments in support of this view are: (1) Isaiah 1:2, Deuteronomy 1:31, and Deuteronomy 1:37 contain three rather unusual verbs, which Paul also uses in his opening sentences--"exalted," "carried as a father," and "gave as an heritance"; (2) Deuteronomy 1 would naturally suggest to Paul the historical review of God's dealings with Israel, while the invitation of Isaiah 1:18 would be the basis for the offer of forgiveness with which his persuasive sermon ends; and (3) the lectionaries reveal that these passages were commonly read together on an autumn Sabbath.

Other combinations have also been suggested. Guilding finds it "tempting to suppose" a seder of Deuteronomy 1 and a haphtarah beginning at Jeremiah 30:4.[52] Hartman proposes Genesis 15 and II Samuel 7.[53]

The most likely suggestion, however, is that the seder for the day was Deuteronomy 4:25-40, followed by haphtaroth from Isaiah 40 and II Samuel 7. This view is consistent with the autumn lectionaries, and, more importantly, these passages seem to be the substructure of Paul's entire sermon. Paul appears to be building his theme around a previous reading of Deuteronomy 4:25-40, Isaiah 40:1-11, and II Samuel 7:4-17.

The reading from Deuteronomy emphasizes God's faithfulness to His people and His unprecedented efforts on their behalf:

> (For the LORD thy God is a merciful God;) He will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which He sware unto them.
>
> For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth, and ask from the one side of heaven unto the other, whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it?
>
> Did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and live?
>
> Or hath God assayed to go and take him a nation from the midst of another nation, by temptations, by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm, and by great terrors, according to all that the LORD your God did for you in Egypt before your eyes?
>
> Unto thee it was shewed, that thou mightest know that the LORD he is GOD; there is none else beside him.
>
> Out of heaven he made thee to hear his voice, that he might instruct thee; and upon earth he shewed thee his great fire; and thou heardest his words out of the midst of the fire.
>
> And because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them, and brought thee out in his sight with his mighty power out of Egypt;
>
> To drive out nations from before thee greater and mightier than thou art, to bring thee in, to give thee their land for an inheritance, as it is this day.
>
> Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the LORD he is GOD in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else.
>
> Thou shalt keep therefore his statutes, and his commandments, which I command thee this day, that it

> may go well with thee, and with thy children after thee, and that thou mayest prolong thy days upon the earth, which the LORD thy God giveth thee, forever.[54]

It is fairly easy to see the uses Paul makes of this *seder*. His whole message emphasizes, as does the *seder*, that God is faithful and that He has done unprecedented works on Israel's behalf. Paul repeats the references to the choice of the fathers, the exodus from Egypt, and the conquest of the land as examples of God's continuing deliverance, and then proclaims that God has now climaxed this redemption by bringing the promised Savior to the nation. In his conclusion:

> Behold ye despisers, and wonder, and perish: for I work a work in your days, a work which ye will in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you,[55]

Paul reflects the same spirit of amazement and exhortation that is contained in the words of the *seder*:

> For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth, and ask from the one side of heaven unto the other, whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it?[56]
>
> Thou shalt keep therefore his statutes, and his commandments, which I command thee this day, that it may go well with thee.[57]

Paul's theme not only corresponds to the *seder* from Deuteronomy, it also incorporates the *haphtaroth* of Isaiah 40:1-11, and II Samuel 7:41-17. One of his major points--that God, according to promise, prepared the nation for the Savior's coming through John the Baptist--is taken from Isaiah's well-known words:

> The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.
>
> Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain:
>
> And the glory of the LORD shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it.[58]

Furthermore, Paul's assertion that he is declaring "unto you the glad tidings how that the promise which was made to the fathers"--"God hath fulfilled the same to us, their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus," is simply an extension of the words of Isaiah 40:9:

> O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain; O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God!

Paul's choice of a theme to fit the occasion is most noticeable, however, in his use of the haphtarah from II Samuel 7:

> And it came to pass that night, that the word of the LORD came unto Nathan, saying,
>
> Go and tell my servant David, Thus saith the LORD, Shalt thou build me an house for me to dwell in?
>
> Whereas I have not dwelt in any house since the time that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even to this day, but have walked in a tent and in a tabernacle.
>
> In all the places wherein I have walked with all the children of Israel spake I a word with any of the tribes of Israel, whom I commanded to feed my people Israel, saying, Why build ye not me an house of cedar?
>
> Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the LORD of hosts, I took thee from

> the sheepcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel.
>
> And I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth.
>
> Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime.
>
> And as since the time that I commanded judges to be over my people Israel, and have caused thee to rest from all thine enemies. Also the LORD telleth thee that he will make thee an house.
>
> And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom.
>
> He shall build an house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever.
>
> I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men:
>
> But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee.
>
> And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever.
>
> According to all these words, and according to all this vision, so did Nathan speak unto David.[59]

The list of correspondences between this haphtarah and Paul's sermon is almost endless: the redemption from Egypt, the appointment of judges, the removal of Saul, the anticipated Davidic offspring, David's burial with his fathers, the raising up of the Davidic son, the Davidic son as the Divine Son, and the blessings which are sure forever. The whole haphtarah is a record of God's promise to raise up a Davidic son who, as God's Son, will rule forever. It is the great Davidic Covenant, and it permeates the entire development of Paul's theme. Doeve agrees that "this passage of Scripture forms the background of the speaker's entire argument";[60] Goldsmith goes even further and demonstrates that "the complex of OT citations in Acts 13:33-37, is not a random selection, but one carefully conceived on linguistic and theological grounds to show the Jews how God fulfilled his promise to David in II Samuel."[61] It is the haphtarah which leads Paul to declare that "of this man's seed," God, according to promise, has brought the omnipotent and eternal Savior to Israel.

It is clear, therefore, that Paul does not preach just any sermon that has come to mind. Rather, he carefully arranges his remarks around the ideas and concepts contained in the assigned seder and haphtarah readings for this Sabbath. He chooses a theme appropriate to the occasion. In doing so he is able to take advantage of what his audience is already thinking, and to point them to the One of Whom the Law and the Prophets spoke.

The Appropriateness of the Theme to the Audience.--Paul's choice of a theme is not only appropriate to the Scripture readings of the occasion, it is also appropriate to the particular audience he is facing. Three types of worshippers are in the synagogue--Jews, proselytes, and God-fearers--and Paul fashions his message so that he will speak to the religious needs and aspirations of each group.

First and foremost, Paul designs his sermon to win the Dispersion Jews who are probably the majority of his audience. The attitude of Dispersion Jews toward Judaism was a curious mixture of submission to and yet freedom from the historic faith of their ancestors. They had a deep and abiding affection for the holy city of Jerusalem:

> Deepest of all convictions was that of their common centre: strongest of all feelings was the love which bound them to Palestine and to Jerusalem, the city of God, the joy of all the earth, the glory of His people Israel. "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning; let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth.[62]

This affection revealed itself in annual pilgrimages. Josephus put the number of Jews assembled in Jerusalem at the time of the Passover as high as three million; Philo reports that "countless cities come, some over land, others over sea, from east and west and north and south at every feast."[63] The Jews' love for the Holy City also manifested itself in their temple offerings.[64] Yet, as much as they loved Jerusalem, they considered their real home to be the foreign country in which they had been born and raised and in which their lot was cast. They had taken over the language and civilization of their adopted city.

> While they hold the Holy City where stands the sacred Temple of the most high God to be their mother city, yet those which are theirs by inheritance from their fathers, grandfathers, and ancestors even farther back, are in each case accounted by them to be their fatherland.[65]

When they first entered the industrial and commercial life of the community, the Dispersion Jews gladly obeyed the ancient prophet's counsel to a previous generation of exiles: "Seek the welfare of the city where I have sent you into exile, and pray to the LORD on its behalf, for in its welfare you will find your welfare."[66] Such a position was not favorable to the sway of traditionalism. As full citizens of a new land--in Antioch the Jews had been granted equal privileges with the native inhabitants[67]--it was inevitable that they would lose the keen edge of Palestinian Judaism. The old laws and forms did not have the same force in the Diaspora that they had in Judea. The Jews of this region, for instance, tolerated such departures from strict Judaism as a Jewess married to an unbelieving Greek.[68] They were also relatively indifferent to the ancient Messianic promises concerning a kingdom and a throne:

> It was different in the Dispersion. The Messianic hope, of course, existed there also, but in a diluted form and at a dimmer distance, less vividly than in the homeland. There the Jews had to some extent come to terms with things as they were, living as they did under the easy political and civil liberties of the cities and of the Roman Empire . . . they had no reason to look with excessive eagerness for the overthrow of the present world-order.[69]

But while they may have lapsed a bit in certain areas, the Jews of Pisidian Antioch were at one with their Palestinian brothers when it came to the Messianic promises which concerned a Savior. Like all Jews everywhere, they were waiting for the day when God would visit and redeem His people, and raise up a horn of salvation for them in the house of His servant David.[70]

As was noted in Chapter II interest in and enthusiasm for the Messiah's coming had been building throughout Jewry for years. References to Him in the literature were becoming more frequent.[71] Speculations as to the time of Messiah's coming engrossed Jews everywhere. It was widely thought that His advent was near at hand.[72]

In Palestine, many pseudo-Messianic movements sprang up to take advantage of this mood of expectation. The New Testament mentions three of these in Acts 5:36, 37, and 21:18.[73] Such movements all came to bloody and disastrous ends, but their frequency and popularity illustrate the temper of the times. The Jews were looking for the Messiah and for the salvation He would bring. Anyone who could direct their thoughts to His coming was a welcome messenger.

Paul is aware of all these strands of thinking. In the book, Principles of Argumentation, on page 353, George Baker states, "A speaker must determine what are the special interests of his audience and in what way his subject can be connected with them." Paul knows that the Dispersion Jews' submission to, and yet independence from, Palestinian Judaism is to his advantage. It means that a message rooted in the ancient faith of the fathers will be welcomed. It also means that any new features of that ancient faith will receive a thoughtful and open hearing. In light of these attitudes, therefore, Paul shapes his theme. He speaks of the ancient promises, of God's continuing care for Israel, and of the long-awaited Holy One. In this he acknowledges the common ties of all Jews everywhere. But Paul also speaks to the independence of the Dispersion Jew. He boldly mentions the inadequacy of the old system and the superiority of the new, proclaiming a forgiveness and a justification that were not available under the law of Moses. He concerns himself, furthermore, with that part of the Messianic hope that is of major concern to a Dispersion audience --the coming of the "Savior." He does not dwell on the Messianic prophecies concerning a throne and a kingdom, prophecies of immense interest only to a Palestinian Jew. His focus, rather, is on that more pervading desire which has survived generations of exile. Paul's good news for this particular audience is that God, according to promise, has brought to Israel a "Savior."

Paul's theme is also appropriate for the proselytes in his audience, those Greeks and native Phrygians[74] who have been converted to Judaism by the missionary efforts of the Dispersion Jews. Through circumcision, baptism, and a sacrifice, these proselytes have entered the Jewish community,[75] have assumed the yoke of the whole law,[76] and have become equal with native Israelites in both obligations and rights.[77] They live, think, and believe as Jews, so that as Paul speaks to the needs and aspiration of Dispersion Jews, he is also proclaiming an appropriate message for Dispersion proselytes.

The Dispersion Jews brought men to their religion with such success that converts could be found wherever the Jews settled throughout the Graeco-Roman world. Josephus, with only slight exaggeration, proudly boasts:

> The masses have long since shown a keen desire to adopt our religious observances; and there is not one city, Greek or barbarian, nor a single nation, to which our custom of abstaining from work on the seventh day has not spread, and where the fasts and the lightings of lamps and many of our prohibitions in the matter of food are not observed.[78]

Christ told the Pharisees: "You traverse sea and land to make a single proselyte,"[79] and the philosopher Seneca complained, "The ways of those dreadful people have taken deeper and deeper root and are spreading throughout the whole world. They have imposed their customs on their conquerors."[80]

The making of these proselytes "reached its highest peak and met with its greatest success toward the middle of the first century A.D.,"[81] the period of Paul's preaching.

The third group of people in Paul's audience are those non-Jews who prefer a more loose attachment to the synagogue than that required of a proselyte. Many of them have been drawn initially to the synagogue by nothing more than a "general interest in oriental religions, an interest which induced the Gentiles to seek salvation, sometimes in the eastern mystery cults, and sometimes in the synagogue."[82]

According to Schurer, it was:

> The fashion of the time to patronize Oriental religions generally. The religions of classical antiquity no longer exercised the same absolute power of attracting the minds of men as once they did. On all hands, people were itching for something new and they eagerly clutched at those mysterious Oriental worships which, owing to increased intercourse and more extended commercial relations, were every day becoming more widely known.[83]

General interest, however, soon developed into admiration. Judaism, after all, "offered itself as the supreme way of life, justified by the oldest book in the world, and expressing itself in a practical discipline of moral and holy living superior to anything offered by the other ancient religions."[84] Some Gentiles even went so far as to contribute to the annual temple collection.[85] But admiration stopped short of complete conversion, mostly because of the requirement of circumcision and the burdensome obligations which it entailed. Instead, these Gentiles were content to attend the synagogue services, accept its monotheistic teaching about God, and observe certain moral principles of the Old Testament that were considered valid for all men. (These principles were known as the "Noachin" commandments, because they were said to have been given by Noah to his sons. Seven in number, they were directed against blasphemy, idolatry, fornication, the shedding of blood, robbery, the use of meat containing blood, and disobedience to legal authorities.)[86] The Gentile admirers of Judaism carefully observed such principles of morality. Also, because of their recognition of the God of Israel as the one true God, these partial adherents to the synagogue were commonly called "God-fearers."[87]

Paul's sermon is especially appropriate to these God-fearers. Twice he addresses himself to them,[88] to make sure they understand that the message is for them. "Interest grows with knowledge, and it may be developed if not present at first."[89] Actually, and more significantly, the entire thrust of Paul's theme is ideally suited to the needs and aspirations of the God-fearers. For them, Judaism was an attractive, but dead-end street; no outlet of salvation appeared at the end. As long as the God-fearer shrank from circumcision and its accompanying legalism, he remained an alien to the commonwealth of Israel and a stranger to the covenants of promise.[90] If he had any hope of sharing in the mercies of God through Judaism, it was only because he was clinging to the skirt of a Jew.[91]

To this sincere yet disenfranchised God-fearer, Paul's message is a message of hope and opportunity. The demands of Jewish legalism are put aside. A full and free salvation is available irrespective of race or upbringing. Paul offers equal rights and privileges apart from the intolerable burden of circumcision. He proclaims a Savior who will provide forgiveness and justification for any man who will simply believe. There could not have been a more fitting or welcome message for those who had been standing on the outskirts of God's grace.

Thus, Paul's theme is appropriate to the needs and aspirations of all segments of his audience. His sermon is exactly suited to the attitudes and expectations of the Jews, the proselytes, and the God-fearers of Pisidian Antioch.

The Structure of the Sermon

Is this speech, in its plan of arrangement, particularly accommodated to the audience situation? How does the Apostle argue his case? What are his underlying assumptions?

Paul has definitely accommodated his sermonic arrangement to the audience situation, for he has chosen a pattern that is familiar to his hearers. The arrangement of his message is consistent with the pattern of preaching that synagogue worshippers have come to expect.

Synagogue sermons followed a distinct pattern.[92] They started with an initial text which was not part of the _seder_ or _haphtarah_ for the day. The speaker, however, was not allowed to choose this initial text at random. Instead, he had to choose a text in which at least one word tallied linguistically with a word in the _haphtarah_. This linguistic link was to be a bridge between the initial text and the _haphtarah_.

The body of the sermon then proceeded with an explanation or interpretation of the initial text. The explanation involved the quoting of a series of other verses of Scripture, which would be pieced together so as to carry forward the thought of the original text. This process was known as haruzin, a word which basically means "stringing pearls."

During the course of the haruzin, the speaker would either quote explicitly from, or more often simply allude to, the haphtarah of the day. The haphtarah was always in the background of the exposition; it was tacitly employed throughout the body of the sermon.

The process of stringing verses together was not to be a random one. Rather, it was to point the message in a particular direction, towards a final text which would form the conclusion of the sermon. This final text was usually taken from the seder reading of the day. Occasionally, the final text was taken from some other part of Scripture, but even then it would point directly to the seder. Thus, synagogue sermons started with an initial text linguistically related to the haphtarah; they proceeded by haruzin which implied the haphtarah, and perhaps quoted from it; and the haruzin led directly to a text which either came out of or pointed to the seder.

Paul's sermon follows the exact structure of synagogue sermons with one additional feature--an introduction which is based largely on the seder from Deuteronomy. According to classical rhetoric, he had his choice of two kinds of Exordium, or introductions: the principium, which performed the function without any beating about the bush, and *insinuatio*, the indirect approach.[93] Paul's *exordium* was of the *insinuatio*, or indirect, approach since his position was uncertain. His opening remarks were used to make his listeners attentive and well-disposed. Hence, Paul's first words, "The God of this people of Israel. . . ." were conciliatory. The *Ad Herennium* suggests the use of such an introduction. Later, Sir Thomas More hypothesized that an ability to fit speech to circumstances was a far more important attribute than absolute knowledge or goodness.

Rather than plunge immediately into an initial text related to the *haphtarah*, Paul builds up to his initial text by first developing the key ideas of the *seder*--the faithfulness of God in redeeming Israel through the choice of the fathers, the exodus from Egypt, and the gift of the land. Then he quotes his initial text as the climax of this process of redemption:

> I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfill all my will.

After quoting his initial text, taken from I Samuel 13:14, Paul begins to expound it by showing that its interpretation involves the promises of God to bring the Davidic Savior to Israel. The form of Paul's quotation of I Samuel 13:14 is a bit strange. At first sight he seems to have run different quotations together, and his citation is usually explained (Cf. the margin in the Nestle text) as the combining of three passages: "I have found David" (Psalm 89:20);

"The Lord has sought Him a man after His Own heart" (I Samuel 13:14); and "He shall perform all My pleasure" (Isaiah 44:28). But there is another less complicated explanation of Paul's words. An Aramaic targum on I Samuel 13:14 has it in the form, "The Lord hath sought Him a man doing His will." In the targum the phrase "doing His will" is a substitute for the Hebrew "after His Own heart." It is quite possible that Paul incorporated the targum reading in the quotation of his initial text.[94]

The familiar process of haruzin is soon evident as Paul successively quotes and applies Psalm 2:7, Isaiah 55:3, and Psalm 16:10. Also, during the course of the Haruzin, he continually alludes to the haphtaroth of Isaiah 40:1-11 and II Samuel 7:4-17.

In all respects, therefore, Paul's structure is consistent with the accepted pattern of synagogue preaching. He chose to put his thoughts into an organizational framework that was familiar to his audience. This choice on his part made it easier for his hearers to follow him, and increased the likelihood that they would respond to his message. He followed the classical rhetorical injunction that the message must be adapted to the peculiar conditions of the audience and audience situation. As Cicero urged, "No single kind of oratory suits every audience."[95] One's approach must vary with the group.

As was noted in Chapter II, Cicero spoke, in his De

Partitione Oratoria, of the speaker's resources as a speaker, which included five subdivisions: Inventio; Dispositio; Elocutio; Memoria, and Pronuntiatio. Inventio was pre-eminent. Expanding on this point, Cicero stated that to help himself in this matter of ideas for speech materials, one had to determine the status of his case. This stasis was at the heart of the classical notion of Inventio, and was the crux of Cicero's De Invention. To Cicero, the classical notion of Invention was not discovery, but rediscovery, and constitutio or stasis was dictated only by the logic of controversy. The Issue was the point of dispute on which the whole case turned. The Roman orator emphasized knowledge instead of rules.

Paul appears to argue his case with these classical concepts in view. The point of dispute in his sermon at Antioch is whether Jesus who was crucified at Jerusalem is the promised Savior, Son of David, and the means of justification by faith. On this issue Paul's whole case turns. The issue emerges out of the development of the Apostle's ideas, out of the logic of controversy, and the teaching situation. Cicero and Augustine assert that instruction should come before persuasion. As Cicero stated, "to teach is a necessity," and then he goes on to add, "to please is a sweetness, to persuade is a victory."[96] In the words of Saint Augustine, "Persuasion is not a necessity because it need not always be applied if the listener consents through teaching. . . . delight is not a necessity either. . . . The matter itself is pleasing when it is revealed simply because it is true."[97] Thus, Paul seeks above all to teach the truth: "the thing discussed does not need verbal ornaments, nor motions of the affections to persuade, but evidence as proof."[98]

In his argument, Paul reveals knowledge, as Cicero required: knowledge of the various strands of thinking within his audience; knowledge of the on-going reactions of his listeners; and knowledge not only of Jewish history and Scripture, but also of present and recently passed events of which his audience has probably heard little or nothing. Hence, he uses the Ciceronian topics of Distribution of past and present, in relation to Jewish history up through the resurrection of Jesus. He also uses Cicero's topic of Cause and Effect. Because God loved the fathers, He led Israel out of Egypt and gave them an inheritance and divinely-appointed saviors. Because God found David to be a man after His Own heart who would fulfill all His will, God promised David that his kingdom would endure forever, and of his seed would come the Savior. Because the Jews at Jerusalem did not know the voices of the prophets, or recognize their Messiah, they slew Him. Because Jesus was God's holy Anointed One, God raised Him from the dead. Because He was God's sacrifice once and for all, and arose from the grave, Jesus is the eternal, omnipotent Savior able to forgive sin.

Thus, Paul incorporates the logic of cause-and-effect throughout all of his systematic theological statement.

In devising arguments in his *Inventio*, Paul also follows the Topic questions of Rhetoric: "What? When? Where? How? and Why?"

What?	God's deliverance of Israel through David's seed.
When?	"in your days."
Where?	at Jerusalem.
How?	in that God has raised up Jesus from the dead and "through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins."
Why?	According to God's promise, and to fulfill all His will.

This last topic, "Why?" Paul further relates to Cicero's topic of Consistency.[99] God is consistently faithful to His promises to His chosen people, and out of His consistency the fulfillment of His promise and the good news have come.

A critical appraisal of Paul's total organizational plan reveals that his structure is consistent with the *dispositio* of classical rhetoric. It will be remembered that in its strictest sense, *dispositio* includes the method of arrangement, and the order in which the ideas are developed. Paul's speech follows the traditional division found in *De Oratore*: ". . . the minds of the audience should be conciliated"; (Here Paul recites Hebrew history, vs. 17-22); "next, our case should be stated"; (God hath raised unto Israel a Savior, Jesus: vs. 23-30);[100] then "the point in controversy should be established."[101] (God promised the coming of a Davidic Son; John foretold His coming; "they . . . fulfilled all that was written of Him. . . . But God raised Him from the dead. . . . by Him all that believe are justified" [vs. 29-39].) Paul's arguments are those of a careful logician, conforming to general rules of argumentative development: in this case, inductive reasoning. "The orator," Cicero declared, "will have the subtlety of the logician, the thoughts of the philosopher, and the memory of a lawyer."[102] In Paul's careful logic, in his understanding and identification with the Hebrew religious mind, in his presentation of the culmination of Hebrew religion in Jesus the Savior, and in his ability to recall supportive Scriptures appropriate to the occasion, the Apostle fulfills all three of the Ciceronian required qualities.

Paul also follows Cicero's stress that the method of arrangement should always be adapted to the purpose of the speech. As has already been explained, there were two types of arrangement: that according to the rules, and that where the orator uses his judgment to vary the order. Quintilian later said that most rules are subject to change because of the nature of the case, "by circumstances of time and place and by the dictates of necessity. Thus, the most important quality for the orator is judgment."[103] Using good judgment, Paul chooses the second kind of arrangement, making the order of his speech fit the pattern of synagogue preaching as well as rules concerning the logic of controversy. He presents first those topics of argument with which he knows his audience will agree, saving the resurrection of Jesus and the doctrine of justification by faith until last. As was wisely said, "Nature herself will lead him (the speaker) to understand what he ought to say first."[104]

It was pointed out in Chapter II that in accordance with earlier rhetoricians, Cicero sets forth in *De Inventione* the six parts of a speech (*partes orationis*): the *exordium* or introduction, the *narratio* or statement of facts, the *divisio* or *partitio*, which is "the statement of the point at issue and exposition of what the orator proposes to prove," the *confirmatio* or "exposition of arguments," the *confutatio*, which is the "refutation of one's opponent's arguments," and *conclusio* or *peroratio*.

Paul follows this *oratio* of Cicero. First he gives an *exordium*, conciliatory in nature, including all members of his audience; then he presents a *narratio*, or statement of facts relating to Israel's history. The *narratio* had to be plausible, but not necessarily an exact account of what actually happened. Thus, Paul can skip over the rebellion of Israel against God's leadership by asking for a king. He can later smooth over the unbelief (or selfish jealousy) of the Jewish rulers who slew Jesus. Not all the facts of Paul's speech are stated in the initial *narratio*. Rather, the Apostle follows Cicero's suggestion that when events have to be explained away by the argument, such as the crucifixion of Jesus by the Jews, and His burial, it is wise to distribute statements of facts throughout the speech.[105] When Paul comes to divisio or partitio he states the point at issue: "Of this man's seed hath God according to His promise raised unto Israel a Savior, Jesus." The Apostle has freely stated the historical facts with which he knows his audience will agree, but after stating the point at issue, he does not give an orderly exposition of what he is going to prove. Paul cannot afford to give his audience a preview of the main arguments he intends to expound, lest he lose their sympathy before he has fully conveyed his message. Cicero also said, "When to use narratio and when not is a matter for the orator's discretion . . . The divisio, too, is sometimes missing, sometimes obscured, and sometimes out of place."[106] In Paul's speech, each of the "partes orationis" is in its place; he just does not expound in the divisio on what he is going to prove before he begins to prove it. Instead, as soon as he has stated the point at issue, Paul immediately brings confirmatio--affirmative proof or exposition of arguments; the arguments are the most important part of his speech. He then makes his final warning both a confutatio--refutation of doubt which the Adversary might raise--and a peroratio, or conclusio.

Paul's speech is an exposition adapted to tactfully persuade of what has been done.[107] Quintilian suggests that an orator must *consider* under what prepossessions of the public he is to speak, and what opinion it is likely that his audience as judges has formed previous to the commencement of his pleadings.[108] The speaker's next step is to apply his facts so as to persuade his audience. Paul presents his message as if bringing new features to the ancient faith--fulfillments about which his audience has not heard and has formed no opinion. In seeking to persuade his audience he seems to follow the three primary modes of persuasion Aristotle suggested, which are mentioned in Chapter II.[109] The first mode is the *character of the Speaker*, who addresses the audience in such a way as to make himself worthy of belief. Paul does this by first sympathetically identifying himself with the Jews ("*our* fathers"), and then by reviewing their Scriptures carefully, showing himself to be knowledgeable and reverent concerning them. The second mode was to stir up *emotion* in the listeners. By his historical review, Paul rouses within the audience emotions of national pride and trust in God's faithfulness: emotions which would affect decision and help effect persuasion. Using the third mode of Aristotle, he seeks to *demonstrate the truth* he proclaims, and thus to persuade. His *narratio* is a statement of facts following the standards set forth by Isocrates that such statements should be brief, clear, and plausible; and after stating the point at issue, Paul expounds his clear arguments of facts which affirm his positive side of the point of dispute.

We can commend Paul's logical capacities in the light of his (1) "recognition of the problem which, at the moment, is . . . about to disturb the status quo"; (2) "his analysis of the nature and bearing of the problem upon the social setting"; (3) "his fertility of mind in suggesting ideas relevant to the solution" of objections in the minds of the audience; (4) "his acuteness in examining, through reasoning, the implication of his suggestion"--namely, that Jesus is the expected Holy One and Saviour--and (5) "the verification of his judgment following the acceptance"[110] of the glad tidings he offers; for many of his listeners do believe this greatest work God has done for Israel, and doubtless receive the verification of its truth through the witness of God's spirit.

As Clark points out, rhetoric concerns itself with contingent and approximate truth: those which lead to differences of opinion.[111] By "proof" it does not mean scientifically demonstrated truths, but persuasive argument. Paul seeks to persuasively deal with whether the promised advent of the Messiah has come, whether His crucifixion was justified or not justified, and whether He has indeed risen from the dead to become the Savior of all who believe. Paul argues logically, demonstrating that "It is relevant to teaching not only to explain those things that are hidden and to solve the difficulties of questions, but also, while these things are being done, to introduce other questions which might by chance occur, lest what is said be rendered improbable or be refuted by them." Paul introduces the questions "in such a way that they are answered at the same time."[112] Yet Cicero and Quintilian believed that oratory should consist not only of mere logical chains, but also of oratorical pleadings.[113] Interestingly, Paul places his narrative of facts between pleading the promises of God which are now fulfilled in Jesus, and the examples of past promises already kept. (Cicero wrote that the greatest support of a probability is an example.)[114]

The Apostle's conclusion, or peroratio, follows classical lines of brevity and summarization, with appeals to the feelings; here, to the feelings of caution, and even fear.[115]

It must be remembered that Cicero suggested that the speech-situation could be either one involving a general discussion or one concerned with particular persons or occasions. The latter, called causa or "case" included forensic speaking, having to do with the justice of actions which took place in the past. Having decided on this stasis, or constitutio juridicialis, the orator must next decide on the ratio: the line of defense. Particular attention had to be given by the speaker to a discussion of why the event took place, of the innocence or guilt of the one accused, and of laws both civic and natural. These Paul discusses, as though acquainted with the lines of forensic speaking, though it is only a part of his speech. He touches on the blindness and guilt of the Jewish rulers, and their ignorance of prophecy as the cause for Christ's death. He affirms the innocence of Jesus, Son of David, with such words as "Whose shoes . . . I am not worthy to loose"; "they found no cause of death in Him"; and "God raised Him from the dead." Paul further argues that the civic and religious laws of Moses, and the natural law of death, have been superseded by the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus.[116]

The Apostle reveals underlying assumptions regarding the fact of the faithfulness and the justice of God, and the fact of a Resurrection, and its signal of God's approval of Jesus. Other basic assumptions that underlie this sermon are the fact of immortality, the validity of the Old Testament and its prophecy, and the audience's knowledge of it, their expectation of the Messiah, and the possibility of justification by faith.

The overall structure of Paul's speech is deliberative. It is given before a public assembly of people who must make a decision about something that has happened, being urged to do something. Paul aims at establishing the expediency of his proposed course of action. He advocates that his listeners believe on Jesus, being concerned about their future. As befits a deliberative speaker, according to Aristotle and Cicero, he seeks to prove to his listeners that the course of action he urges is possible, that it will do good, and is necessary; and that the harm will be great if they reject the proposal.[117] According to Aristotle, such counsel

> can only be given on matters about which people deliberate; matters, namely, that ultimately depend on ourselves, and which we have it in our power to set going. For we turn a thing over in our mind until we have reached the point of seeing whether we can do it or not.[118]

According to Aristotle and Cicero, the objective of deliberation is utility. Paul seeks to show the Jews of Antioch how the action he advocates is directed to their welfare.[119] Further, according to Cicero, the aim of the deliberative speaker is also honor. The deliberative orator speaks of what is praiseworthy and right.[120] Paul reveals himself to have this concern also, since he speaks of a Savior Who is unjustly slain, yet resurrected, and the means of man's justification. This Savior is "worthy"--worthy of acceptance, honor, and praise.

To summarize, in the structure and arrangement of his speech, Paul's purpose is aligned with the purpose of classical rhetoric, which was to give effectiveness to truth as the speaker saw it. He appears to follow formal rules of composition. His arrangement, though also historical, is chiefly a logical one. It is based on the continuity of his reasoning process, and is consistent with the concepts and order of classical rhetoric as well as with the accepted pattern of synagogue preaching. Logically, "materials are placed at those points where they serve as links in the uninterrupted sequences or chains of thought."[121] It is clear that Paul seeks to persuade, and has selected and arranged the ideas so as to make them acceptable and potent. He takes into account his listeners' motives, emotions, and prejudices. The main ideas show that he evinced "an intelligent understanding of the nature of his audience, and applied that understanding and insight to the practical task of disposing his hearers in his behalf."[122] He readily perceived that his own authority and the truthfulness of his teaching could be under suspicion, and that confirmation of these must be brought about by a closely reasoned explanation of the relationship between the Jewish law and the Christian gospel. The Apostle's total inductive reasoning is adequate to move an audience to action; the classic rhetorical approach, being pragmatic and functional, aimed for that result.[123] Paul's sequence leads the minds of his hearers from point to point, in an orderly and balanced whole, toward one goal: Persuasion.

Analysis of Style and Delivery

What is "style?"

Before discussing Paul's style of speaking specifically, we will briefly note how others have defined style, and then also how they saw its relationship to the other five parts of rhetoric.

Plato had distrusted style as a means of persuasion;

however, his famous pupil, Aristotle, developed it, stating in his third book (1, p. 345), that it is not enough to know what one ought to say, but one must also know how to say it, and this contributes largely to the character of the speech. He declares that style should be clear and appropriate, and neither shabby nor gaudy. He also considers the matter of rhythm and figures of speech. Style, then, according to Aristotle, could be defined as that which contributes to the character of an oration.

Theophrastus, a student of Aristotle, as the latter had been of Plato, further developed his master's ideas regarding the stylistic phase of rhetoric. The ideas of Theophrastus were in time taken up and enlarged upon by writers such as Demetrius of Phalereum. Aristotle was a philosopher who saw in rhetoric a human activity deserving serious study, and therefore gave it place in his comprehensive survey of knowledge. Theophrastus and Demetrius were also philosophers who wrote on rhetorical theory as one of the many branches of knowledge.

Demetrius represented oratorical theory in its most embellished form. Between 345 and 283 B.C., he became the last Greek orator of distinction, but it is generally agreed that his name stands for the decline of eloquence. His oratory was sure, elegant, polished, and subtle, but his style had numerous defects and could also be described as effeminate, emotional, flowery, and fake. He practiced much of what had been condemned by those philosophers who had criticized rhetoric from the day of the first sophistic, for he employed many petty tricks of speech and figures. The author of "On Style," his kind of oratory met the opposition of early Church fathers, for, in fact, it was anything but inspired in manner. Demetrius was a man of dissipated personal life and weak character, so that in this case style might accurately be defined as "the man."

Cicero, as we know, later defined style as the result of amplification based upon thorough knowledge. Style is not based on rules, he asserted, but upon psychology, experience, ethos, and pathos. Much will be said about Cicero's suggestions concerning style throughout this paper.

Thomas Wilson included in the first comprehensive treatment of rhetoric in our language this definition: "Elocution is an applying of apte woordes and sentences to the matter, founde out to confirme the cause . . ."[124]

In the 18th century we read the following:

> Eloquence hath always been considered, and very justly, as having a particular connexion with language. It is the intention of eloquence to convey our sentiments into the minds of others, in order to produce a certain effect upon them. Language is the only vehicle by which this conveyance can be made. The art of speaking, then, is not less necessary to the orator than the art of thinking. Without the latter, the former could not have existed; without the former, the latter would be ineffective.[125]

It could justly be deduced from these words that style is the manner whereby thought is expressed in language, in order to produce a certain effect upon listeners or readers.

Hugh Blair was more specific. He affirmed concerning style:

> The best definition I can give of it is, the peculiar manner in which a man expresses his conceptions, by means of Language. . . . Style has always some reference to an author's manner of thinking. It is a picture of the ideas which rise in his mind, and of the manner in which they rise there.[126]

Thus Blair intimates that there is a very close connection between style and invention. Adequate invention is the primary underlying requirement (not "characteristic") of style. If we accept the theory that we think in words, the relationship between style and invention is even more apparent. As taught by Quintilian, good sense and knowledge must be presented in a style that is pleasing to the audience, to the end that the speaker might persuade them. Blair has this end in mind, also, when he says, "Eloquence is the Art of Speaking in such a manner as to attain the end for which we speak."[127]

"Longinus," at the beginning of the Christian Era, made a comprehensive statement regarding the sources of style which further illustrates this issue:

> First and most important is vigor of mental conception. . . . Second is strong and inspired emotion. . . . Others: the adequate fashioning of figures (both of speech and of thought), nobility of diction which in turn includes the choice of words and the use of figurative and artistic language; lastly, dignified and distinguished word arrangement.[128]

It seems, then, that while style is vitally connected with the speaker's manner of thought, in its manifested form it has to do with the choice of words and the shaping of clauses and sentences. Ancient rhetoricians seem agreed on this point.

What, then, are the chief attributes of good style? Since the days of Theophrastus and of Ciceronian rhetoric, four basic qualities have been repeatedly set forth--propriety, correctness, perspicuity, and ornateness.[129] All four appear in De Oratore and apply to both the choice of words and their arrangement.[130]

"Propriety" has to do with appropriateness of style and arrangement. "Correctness" refers to the purity of the language: to the correct form of a word. Cicero stated, "We shall preserve case, tense, gender and number," and he included brevity in the term also, because he protested verbosity.[131] "Perspicuity" deals with how to be clear: adopt words that amply express without ambiguity or obtuseness. Language is clear if it excites the memory and the image-making faculty of the mind. It was Saint Augustine's dictum in the spirit of Cicero that in all his utterances the orator should first seek to speak with clarity, that he might be understood; for "if he is not heard with understanding, neither is he heard willingly or obediently."[132]

"Ornamentation" is concerned with the harmonious cadences and rhythm produced by figures of speech. Such figures of speech and thought are listed as Repetition of words, Reiteration,[133] Rhetorical questions, Progression, Antithesis, Exclamation, Metaphor, Simile, Example, and others,[134] including the collecting together of a number of points scattered throughout the speech.[135] Descripto, a lively description of the consequences of an action,[136] and Demonstratio, a vivid picture of events useful for amplification[137] are two other figures. Finally, answering one's own questions or those in the minds of the audience, is also listed under Ornamentation. These are only a few of the many figures listed.[138] Everyone who had been through the schools knew and used these, but they still played an important part in Ciceronian oratory.

Cicero's treatment of style returns to Aristotle's recognition of its relationship to delivery and the emotions. The subject comes up in the De Inventione, Brutus, Orator, De Officiis and, at some length, in De Oratore.[139] The Ciceronian view emphasizes genius rather than art or method. Eloquence is not the offspring of art, but art of eloquence. In his delivery the speaker must accommodate knowledge to the feelings of mankind, but his style should also win the favor of the hearers by emotion.[140] No matter what topic the true orator is speaking on, Cicero states, he will speak with knowledge, method, and bearing. All things must be aptly dealt with by the orator or he is not eloquent.[141] The perfect orator is versatile, a master of all styles, and uses them as occasion and subject matter demand.[142]

Let us now turn to consider the style of the Apostle

Paul in his message to the Jews of Antioch. His training, both Judaic and Hellenistic, seems to have exercised a marked influence on his style.

Paul's method of quoting Scripture, and his Rabbinic style of exegesis, reveal his Judaic training and his adeptness at applying it to his audience. His sermon is sprinkled with Hebraisms, and is semitically flavored throughout. He deliberately chooses certain features of vocabulary and grammar peculiarly suited to a Jewish audience, so that his style of language is correct. He inclines his vocabulary to his Jewish listeners by using the language of the Old Testament. A simple glance at the bold-face type and the marginal references in the Nestle text will reveal how much of Paul's expression is reminiscent of the Jewish Scriptures. His sentences are full of the very words and phrases of the Old Testament.

This tendency toward a Semitic vocabulary can be appreciated further by analyzing the words peculiar to Acts as they occur in Paul's sermon and in the rest of the book. Of the words in Paul's sermon that are peculiar to Acts, 80 per cent are found in the Septuagint and 70 per cent are found in Greek writers prior to the Christian Era. Of the words peculiar to Acts throughout the whole book, only 63 per cent are found in Greek writings prior to the Christian Era. It is evident, therefore, that at Pisidian Antioch, Paul made deliberate efforts to choose words that had a Jewish ring to them.

Paul also suits his grammar to his audience through the frequent use of Semitic idioms and constructions. For example, there is an Hebraism from the Septuagint in verse 22,[144] a "Hebraistic pleonasm" in verse 24,[145] an underlying Aramaic clause of purpose in verse 28,[146] a Semitic impersonal plural used as a passive in verse 29,[147] a casus pendens in verse 32,[148] and an instructional formula used only in addressing Jews, in verse 38.[149]

All of these features of vocabulary and grammar reveal a conscious effort on the part of the speaker to express himself in a style that has propriety, being appropriate to the background of his hearers, and correctness or purity, being spoken in correct word form and sentence construction. The Apostle also exemplifies propriety in arrangement, since he employs the pattern for synagogue sermons in his speech. The parts of his speech are also appropriate to classical rhetoric. His facts are all given in the proper place; he does not attempt to move until he has convinced, or to convince until he has conciliated. Finding his listeners to be attentive, he endeavors to teach them, composing exposition that they may become acquainted with the subject at hand. "In order that those things which are doubtful may be made certain, they must be reasoned out with the use of evidence," Saint Augustine explained, and this Paul does. Then, in order that the audience may "fully accept those things which they acknowledge to be true,"[150] Paul uses exhortation to move them to action. He uses good judgment for the occasion, his concern being chiefly with content, not style, so that his oration is not "too visible a parade of eloquence."[151]

The characteristic of perspicuity is readily recognizable in Paul's straightforward style. He deals with the concrete, not abstractions, and not only with the past but with the NOW. His words amply express without being obtuse, exciting the memories and image-making faculties of his audience, just as suggested in De Oratore. The figures of Samuel, Saul, and David come to mind. Such words as "They took Him down from the tree and laid Him in a sepulchre--But God raised Him from the dead" stimulate mental images. Paul's oration is brief, not verbose, and therefore also correct in the Ciceronian sense, as well as clear. It has nothing lacking and nothing superfluous.

The Apostle exemplifies perspicuity in four ways. First, through (1) Thorough knowledge and understanding of ideas. Paul speaks with knowledge and authority from Scripture and experience, and uses apparently simple words as the elements of profound expressions. His words comprehend within themselves some basic, deep doctrines of the Christian faith: Resurrection, Immortality, the Atonement, and Justification by faith; yet all of these are presented so clearly that Paul's audience should have no difficulty in understanding. The Apostle also exemplifies perspicuity by (2) Discerning vocabulary and (3) Simplicity of grammar. As has been noted, he carefully suits both of these to his Jewish listeners. Paul speaks in the accepted correct and common language, not in a philosophical vocabulary or complex grammar, but in the language popular and well-understood among the Hebrews. As Quintilian quoted from Cicero, "The worst fault in speaking is to adopt a style inconsistent with the idiom of ordinary speech and contrary to the common feeling of mankind."[152] Finally, in order to be clear, Paul uses (4) Direct discourse. He speaks in a style of direct, face-to-face encounter, empathetically, "with great simplicity and direct points of view."[153] He uses 21 second-person pronouns, compared to 9 first-person pronouns. His energy and elegance--the "two excellencies of Style"[154] --never conflict, because above all, Paul desires to be clearly understood and so to persuade; therefore, he never diminishes the directness and force of what he is saying with diffuseness or too much ornateness. Paul speaks in the style which Cicero claimed to be his own, that of the orator Demosthenes; that is, in the style of the Attic, not the Asian, orators. More will be said of these two styles in Chapter V.

Paul uses Ornamentation, the fourth Ciceronian virtue of style, but the Apostle employs it with discretion. "There is no thought," Cicero declares, "which can help the orator unless it is expressed aptly and with finish." The words must be carefully arranged, for rhythm has a good effect.[155] The Apostle uses an eloquent and pleasing rhythm combined with repetition as he rises to the moderate style near the end of his speech. This fact will be expanded upon in the discussion of his delivery.

Through a pointed reference to the Jewish dispersion spoken of in Habakkuk, Paul also employs the figure Descripto which vividly describes the consequences of an action. Here, the action is either believing or refusing to believe.[156] Further, by seeking to answer questions in the minds of his audience, he uses still another figure of speech listed under Ornamentation.

The last four sentences of Paul's oration again exemplify Ornamentation not only through the use of repetition of the same word, and rhythm, but also through the use of progression and climax. Paul has built to a strong, conclusive thesis and warning. As Cicero indicated would be true of the ideal orator, Paul's total meaning is not in until his last word is spoken. His mental acumen and depth of feeling give his final words a vigor and loftiness that climax in amazing power.

Like Cicero, the Apostle speaks with knowledge, method, and bearing. Concerning his bearing, or delivery, we are told only that he beckoned with his hand for the attention of his audience; he may have made no other gestures. Cicero added gestures to make delivery more grand, including such elaborate ones as slapping one's thigh; but Quintilian would approve Paul's more natural style, the calm invitation of which suggests a bearing both poised and earnest. Pagan orators often began their speeches with such a gesture.[157] Paul's bearing, together with the qualities of wisdom, virtue, and goodwill implied in his message--qualities Aristotle commended--gives the Apostle the powerful ethical proof which Cicero recognized to be inherent in delivery, and dependent upon such innate qualities.

In the Orator, Cicero sets forth the Plain, Medium, and Grand styles of delivery, and the three aims of the orator: to instruct, to please, and to win over.[158] Paul concludes a speech delivered mainly in the plain style with the rhythmic embellishments of the moderate style, and finally, the conceptions and fervor of the grand style. Quintilian advised, "As for the speech as a whole, open calmly and gain fire and momentum as you go."[159] The plain style in which Paul delivers most of his message is appropriate and useful for the review of history he intends, for making clear that which has been obscure, and anticipating questions in the minds of the audience. As has been noted, classical rhetoric consigned such teaching to the plain style. "Although our teacher should speak of great things, he should not always speak about them in the grand manner, but in a subdued (plain) manner when he teaches something."[160] In

Paul's didactics at Antioch there is a majestic flow of clear, smooth, authoritative statement with little emotion. Here he is in line with Cicero's definition of style as the result of amplification based upon knowledge. Further, as Saint Augustine points out, "the subdued style alone can be tolerated more readily for a period of time than the grand style alone."[161] And again, "Why is it that those using this plain style are frequently and greatly applauded unless for the reason that truth thus demonstrated, defended, and placed in triumph is a source of delight?"[162]

In his last sentences, however, Paul's use of the rhetorical device of repetition serves to give his words an eloquent and pleasing kind of rhythm in the moderate style. "And by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified. . . . I work a work in your days, a work in which ye shall in no wise believe. . . ." Rhythm was considered a valuable element in good speaking, and without it, ideas and beauties of diction were conceived to lose much of their effect.

Paul's parting warning is in the grand style of vehement persuasion. "Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophets; behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish. . . ." Besides enabling him to use all four of Cicero's major virtues of style, Paul's versatility capacitates him to demonstrate knowledge and use of all three classical styles of delivery which, according to Cicero, must be combined if an orator is to be effective.[163]

Analysis of Pathos and Ethos

Are there evidences of pathos and ethos in Paul's address? Paul's final areas of choice concern the emotional tone of his sermon, and ethos, the conveying of a favorable impression of the character of the speaker to the audience.

The very atmosphere of the Apostle's message is designed to encourage a favorable response both toward his subject and himself. Paul suits his emotional tone to the audience subtly, yet deliberately, as he consistently communicates a spirit of love, empathy, and urgency.

It is noteworthy that the Apostle's primary method of arousing the affections of the audience is to demonstrate his own love toward them. Cicero, in his *Orator* and *Brutus*, emphasizes the necessity for the orator to feel the emotions he tries to arouse.[164] First, Paul reveals his own love for the Jewish nation by his introductory sketch of the history of Israel as the growth and education of a son (Exodus 6:22), lovingly called out of Egypt (Hosea 11:1), carried by his Father in the wilderness, entering at last into his inheritance, but still kept under the tutelage of judges and prophets. Israel, among all nations, the Apostle affirms, is uniquely dear to God. With this topic, which holds much interest for his listeners, Paul reveals great familiarity. He speaks of the institution of the monarchy in Israel not as a rejection of Samuel and God, but simply as a request which was granted. He avoids the offensive word "crucifixion," and instead pictures the rulers as asking that Jesus "be slain." He even alleviates the severity of judgment on those who live in Jerusalem and their rulers by viewing their act against a backdrop of ignorance and prophetic fulfillment.

Furthermore, Paul also reveals his love for the Jewish people by fully identifying himself with them, thus entwining ethos with pathos. The second emotion he projects is one of empathy. His opening statement says that he is one of them--"The God of this people Israel chose our fathers." The choice of the word "our" instead of "your" conveys a positive emotional attitude,[165] a confirmation of the speaker's sympathetic, trustworthy character and position. It contributes further to the atmosphere of warmth and acceptance. "Pathetic proof includes all those materials and devices calculated to put the audience in a frame of mind suitable for the reception of the speaker's ideas."[166]

L. H. Mouat, in his "Approach to Rhetorical Criticism," proposes that the common denominator of rhetorical concepts that produce effectiveness may be conceived as a form of identification, as defined by Kenneth Burke. Burke explains that only by "speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your way with his," do you persuade man. "The term 'identification' includes the art of employing topics in such a way that one's proposals are identified with the beliefs and desires of the audience."[167] Identification is the process of becoming "substantially one" with an audience.

The Apostle very clearly discerns that his message will be disturbing to the "status quo," and so, as has been noted, he thoroughly analyzes the nature and bearing of the message upon this particular social setting. He seeks to give a closely reasoned explanation of the relationship between Jewish history and the Christian gospel, speaking realistically and in harmony with the experience of those whom he addresses. This is true empathy. It also reveals the competence of the speaker.

Paul displays an anticipation of, and familiarity with, the precise questions which are rising in the minds of those whom he addresses, and he competently applies his message so as to answer them. By his words he shows intense sympathy with his fellow human beings, his heart evidently toward these "lost sheep of Israel," and he is anxious that they do not respond with an attitude of rejection. This concern reveals a character of virtue, and goodwill, as well as a spirit of love and identification. In the *Ad Herennium*, the treatment of delivery closes with the observation that good delivery ensures that what the orator says seems to come from the heart.[168] Cicero and Quintilian had the same viewpoint;[169] Paul demonstrates it.

By communicating a spirit of love and empathy in all of these ways, Paul creates a favorable attitude on the part of his hearers, and facilitates their acceptance of his message. Yet there is no instance of emotion being used for emotion's sake. Each appeal to the feelings grows naturally out of the significance of the logical arguments presented.

The third emotion that Paul nurtures throughout his sermon is that of urgency. He deliberately persuades to a response by suggesting the consequences of unbelief and by stressing that the present generation of Israelites must take action.

First of all, Paul suggests in the introduction that God will reject those who disobey Him, whether they be Jews or Gentiles: God "destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan," and "removed" Saul because of iniquity and disobedience. The implication is that any present unbelief will result in the same consequences--whether the unbelievers are among the nation of His first-born or among the God-fearers or the Gentiles.

The sense of urgency is heightened in the conclusion as Paul again warns that rejection of God's message brings serious danger. This argument involves the notion of fear. Irving J. Lee remarks, in his article on "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal in Rhetorical Theory," that:

> It is more important that the critic define the argument as one which involves the notion of fame, wealth, health, fear, anger, or pity, and define it accurately, than that he be concerned whether fame, wealth, health are topoi of happiness or topoi of the emotions.[170]

Paul's quote from Habakkuk brings dire thoughts to mind: few escaped the consequences of unbelief in Habakkuk's day. When the people perished, Israel's monarchy ended, and the nation went into captivity. The Apostle's appeal to the fear that salvation may not be refused without peril is an appeal that springs from the logic involved. Pathos issues naturally from the momentous significance of the theme, and the conclusions Paul draws from reasoned argument. God is doing a work in their day which they must believe: "It is to us that the message of this salvation has been sent"; "we are declaring to you the good news of the promise made to the fathers--that God has fulfilled it to us, the children, by raising Jesus"; "through this One forgiveness of sins is being proclaimed to you." (The underlined words are those given special emphasis by the word order of the Greek text.) The emphasis on the appearance of the Savior in the lifetime of this audience points to the necessity of a right and ready response. This is an example of the Apostle's typical intertwining of logos with pathos. Out of the facts implied by his logic comes an emotion which he himself shares as part of his own clear convictions. In this way he again reveals the personal qualities that Aristotle first discussed as ethical proof: competence, virtue, and goodwill.

For a speech to be effective in the sense of quality, it can no more be a lie to the life of the speaker than it can be to the truth of reality. Actually, Paul's sermon, because of his background and belief, is fused with the speaker himself, so that the man and the message are one. Both an experiential and intellectual understanding of the risen Lord Jesus are his; his mouth speaks out of the fullness of his heart. This *ethos* doubtless contributes toward a sensing of the truth in all he says. Besides, he is, after all, in the synagogue, and speaking at the invitation of the synagogue rulers. He also is following the usual pattern for such sermons, revealing familiarity with synagogue procedure, and with the ancient Scriptures. His message itself appears to be about the fulfillment of those truths. As Plato insisted in the *Phaedrus*, the truth must be known by the *orator* first.

Throughout his sermon Paul has made choices according to the particular situation at Antioch. Further, "the rhetorical is determined by the epistemological."[171] Paul's choices cannot be divorced from his view of reality because they betray "not only his *Weltanschauung* but his perception of the *Weltanschauung* of his audience. . . . a rhetor will tend to make assumptions which he believes his audience will grant."[172] Paul's logos is his chief concern, for it will point his listeners to the living Logos. However, he is careful to incorporate with his words a style and those emotional and ethical overtones which are in line with the needs, characteristics, and demands of this unique audience.

Summary

Paul's sermon to the Jews in Acts 13 takes place in a synagogue of Pisidian Antioch before an interested audience. His message centers around God's promises to bring to Israel a Savior. These promises, the Apostle affirms, have all been fulfilled--the nation was prepared, and then Jesus came as the powerful and eternal Savior. As a result of this great work of God, there is available to every man forgiveness of sins and justification from all things. The response to Paul's sermon is immediate and enthusiastic: so much so, that one week later, practically the whole city gathers to hear him preach again.

Paul's success in so effectively persuading his audience can be attributed to the choices he makes. He chooses a theme that is appropriate to the occasion in that it corresponds with the _seder_ and _haphtarah_ readings for that Sabbath. His theme is also appropriate to the Jews, proselytes, and God-fearers in his audience, for it speaks to the religious needs of each group. Further, in devising arguments to amplify his theme, he appears to apply the classical notion of _inventio_ and stasis. His point of dispute in this sermon is whether Jesus Who was crucified at Jerusalem is the promised Savior, Son of David, and the means of justification by faith. Paul also seems to employ Topics of classical rhetoric.

In addition to an appropriate theme, the Apostle uses an arrangement familiar to synagogue worshippers, and he closely reasons and expounds his message from Scripture. "Exposition is often the basis of speeches which aim at conviction or persuasion. . . . There can be no sound argument without clear exposition as its foundation."[173] Paul's speech is deliberative in the classical sense, and also follows the traditional standards, purpose, division, and three modes of persuasion of classical rhetoric. His argument is climactic. His _exordium_, _narratio_, _divisio_, or _partitio_, _confirmatio_, _confutatio_, and _peroratio_ or _conclusio_ are easily traced. His style is peculiarly suited to a Jewish context, but also follows that of the Attic orators, Demosthenes and Cicero. Like Cicero, he speaks with knowledge, method, and bearing, using an opening gesture as the pagan orators did. He exemplifies versatility, speaking in all three of the classical styles of delivery, and he demonstrates all four of Cicero's major virtues of style, using some of the well-known classical figures of speech. He employs those pathos and evidences of personal character which will stir a warm response. At the same time he epitomizes Plato's orator who knows the truth first, for he displays authority and knowledge based on Scripture, logic, and personal experience. He also demonstrates Cicero's injunction that the orator must himself first feel the emotions he tries to arouse; and he further illustrates the declaration of both the author of the _Ad Herennium_ and of

Cicero that powerful proof is inherent in delivery which seems to come from the heart. ". . . Right persuasion is animated by respect for, and sympathy with, the humanity and the individuality of others."[174]

In all these areas, Paul adapts himself and his message to the nature and needs of this particular situation, and of this unique audience. His purpose is aligned with that of classical rhetoric, which was to give effectiveness to truth as the speaker saw it, and to win. "Eloquence is always an aim at a mark; as Daniel Webster defined it, it is 'always a progress on, right on, to an object.' That object in the end is always persuasion."[175] "No one can give Faith," says Matthew Arnold, "Unless he has Faith; the persuaded persuade."[176]

FOOTNOTES

[1] Werner Jaeger, Early Christianity and Greek Paideia (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1965), pp. 5, 6.

[2] Acts 13:4-12.

[3] W. M. Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul: Their Influence on His Life and Thought (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1907), p. 297. This autumn dating becomes significant in the rhetorical analysis of Paul's sermon.

[4] Acts 13:13, 14.

[5] Philo, On the Contemplative Life or Suppliants, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), 9. 3. 476.

[6] Philo, Every Good Man Is Free, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), 9. 12. 458.

[7] Cf. Matthew 23:6; Luke 11:43.

[8] The vital relationship between this reading and Paul's subsequent sermon will be developed in a later section.

[9] Frederic Henry Chase, The Credibility of the Book of Acts of the Apostles (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1902), p. 179, n.1.

[10] Philo, Every Good Man Is Free, 9. 12. 458.

[11] Archibald Thomas Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament: The Acts of the Apostles (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930), III:186.

[12] Philo, Moses, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 6. 2. 39. 168; Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, trans. Louis H. Feldman, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 16. 2. 4.

[13] Philo, The Special Laws, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 7. 2. 15. 282.

[14] Ch. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, trans. S. H. Hooke, The History of Civilization, ed. C. K. Ogden (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1939), p. 216.

[15] Giuseppe Ricciotti, The Acts of the Apostles: Text and Commentary, trans. Laurence E. Byrne (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1958), pp. 206, 207.

[16] Charles W. Carter and Ralph Earle, "The Acts of the Apostles," The Evangelical Commentary, ed. George Allen Turner (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959), p. 185.

[17] James Winans, Public Speaking (New York: The Century Company, 1925), p. 185. Winans believes that the same methods are used for gaining action as are used for winning belief.

[18] Max Wilcox, The Semitisms of Acts (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1965), p. 162; and Evald Lovestam, Son and Savior: A Study of Acts 13:32-37. With an Appendix: 'Son of God' in Synoptic Gospels, trans. Michael J. Petry, Vol. 18 of Coniectanea Neotestamentica, ed. Anton Fridrichsen and Harald Riesenfeld (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961), p. 6.

[19] The Jews recognized the choice of the fathers, the liberation from Egypt, and the gift of the land as basic acts of salvation by which God had brought the nation into being. In their rituals and worship they frequently acknowledged these redemptive events as examples of God's continuing deliverance. Cf. Deuteronomy 6:20-24; 26:5-9.

[20] Judges 2:16.

[21] I Samuel 9:15, 16.

[22] II Samuel 3:18.

[23] The audience would be reminded of such passages as II Samuel 7:12; Isaiah 9:6, 7; and Jeremiah 23:5, 6.

[24] Malachi 4:5, 6.

[25] Malachi 3:1; Isaiah 40:3-5.

[26] Luke 1:17.

[27] Matthew 3:2, 8.

[28] Matthew 3:5, 6; Luke 3:7-14.

[29] Acts 13:26.

[30] The audience would be thinking of such Old Testament passages as Psalm 89:25-27 and Isaiah 63:1-4 which speak of one who is the "highest of the kings of the earth" and "mighty to save."

[31] They were fulfilling such prophetic voices as Isaiah 53:1-3, 7-9, and Zechariah 13:5, 6.

[32] Acts 13:30-33.

[33] Psalm 2:2-7.

[34] Evald Lovestam, Son and Savior: A Study of Acts 13: 32-37. With an Appendix: "Son of God" in Synoptic Gospels, pp. 15-23.

[35] II Samuel 7:12-14.

[36] C. H. Dodd, The Old Testament in the New, ed. John Reumann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963), p. 20.

[37] II Samuel 7:12-16; Psalm 89:27-37.

[38] Cf. especially II Samuel 7:12-16; Psalm 89:20-38; and Psalm 132:10-12.

[39] Bishop writes that the expression in Arabic is ra'fat, a feminine plural word, but, as in a few other cases, used as personal name [sic]. ". . . for boys in given circumstances. We have known it amongst Christians, when a family has desired to place on record its gratitude for 'mercies received'" Eric F. Bishop, Apostles of Palestine: The Local Background to the New Testament Church (London: Butterworth Press, 1958), p. 89.

[40] Psalm 16:10.

[41] Julius Schniewind, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittle, trans. and ed., Geoffrey W. Fromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), I, p. 72.

[42] Acts 13:40, 41; Cf. Habakkuk 1:5.

[43] Howard Tillman Kuist, The Pedagogy of St. Paul (New

York: George H. Doran Company, 1925), p. 94; cf. Archibald Thomas Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament: the Acts of the Apostles, III:195.

[44] Habakkuk 1:1-11.

[45] Codex D.

[46] Acts 13:42-44.

[47] Mequilla 4:3; Cf. Luke 4:16-21; Acts 15:21.

[48] Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959), I:443-44.

[49] Leon Morris, The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries, Tyndale Press Monographs (London: The Tyndale Press, 1954), pp. 21, 22.

[50] The full lectionaries for the one- and the three-year cycles are given in Appendix A.

[51] F. W. Farrar, The Life and Work of St. Paul (London: Cassel, Petter, Galpin & Co., 1879), I:368-69; W. M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949), p. 100; Ricciotti, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 207, 208.

[52] Aileen Guilding, The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship; a Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1960), p. 7.

[53] L. Hartman, "David's Son. Apropa Acts 13, 16-41" (David's Son. Apropos of Acts 13:16-41), Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok, 28-29 (1963-64), 117-34, as abstracted by L. M. Dewailly, New Testament Abstracts, 10 (1965), 53, 54.

[54] Deuteronomy 4:31-40.

[55] Habakkuk 1:5.

[56] Deuteronomy 4:32.

[57] Deuteronomy 4:40.

[58] Isaiah 40:3-5.

[59] II Samuel 7:4-17.

[60] M. W. Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (Assen. Netherlands: Van Gorcum and Comp., 1954), p. 172.

[61] Dale Goldsmith, "Critical Notes: Acts 13:33-37; A Pesher on II Samuel 7," The Journal of Biblical Literature, 57 (1968), 324.

[62] Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, I, p. 77.

[63] Josephus, The Jewish War, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1927), 2. 2. 14. 3; Philo, The Special Laws, 3. 1. 12. 223.

[64] Philo gives the details as to how this tribute was collected and carried to Jerusalem in The Special Laws, 1. 14. 204.

[65] Philo, Flaccus, trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), 9. 7. 524.

[66] Jeremiah 29:7.

[67] Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, trans. Ralph Marcus, ed. Allen Wikgren (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 7. 12. 3. 1; Against Apion, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann, 1926), 1. 2. 4. Some even held high office: Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul, pp. 256-58.

[68] Acts 16:1-3.

[69] Johannes Weiss, Earliest Christianity: A History of the Period A.D. 30-150, ed. Frederick C. Grant (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1959), I, p. 221.

[70] Luke 1:68, 69.

[71] Cf. especially the pseudepigraphical books of I Enoch and the Psalms of Solomon.

[72] A survey of the calculations and expectations of first-century Jewry can be found in Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, pp. 150-52 and in Hillel Silver, A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel from the First Through the Seventeenth Centuries (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), pp. 3-5.

[73] Josephus provides fuller comment on these same three movements as well as on other uprisings in Jewish Antiquities, 18. 1. 6; 2. 5. 1. 8. 6, and in The Jewish War, 2. 13. 4. 5.

[74] Ramsay has demonstrated that though Pisidian Antioch was a Roman colony, the Romans themselves did not attend the synagogue in any great numbers (The Cities of St. Paul, p. 313.)

[75] Emil Schurer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Second Division, "The Internal Condition of Palestine, and of the Jewish People, in the Time of Jesus Christ," trans. Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), II, p. 319.

[76] Peah 4:6; Hallah 3:6; Bikkurim 1:4; Sekalim 1:3, 6; Hullin 10:4. Cf. Galatians 5:3.

[77] Philo, The Special Laws, 1. 9. 219.

[78] Josephus, Against Apion, 2. 39.

[79] Matthew 23:15.

[80] Saint Augustine, The City of God, trans. William M. Green, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 2. 6. 11.

[81] Ch. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, p. 231.

[82] Johannes Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, trans. Frank Clarke (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1959), p. 270.

[83] Emil Schurer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Second Division, II, pp. 299, 300.

[84] Ch. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, p. 230.

[85] Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, 14. 7. 2.

[86] Kirsopp Lake, "Proselytes and God-fearers," Additional Notes to the Commentary, ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, Vol. V of The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1920-1933), p. 81. Cf. Kirsopp Lake, "The Apostolic Council of Jerusalem," Ibid., p. 208.

[87] A. B. Davidson, "'They That Fear the Lord,'" The Expository Times, 3 (1891-1892), p. 491.

[88] Vs. 16--"Men of Israel, and you who fear God, listen!" Vs. 26--"Brethren, sons of the descendents of Abraham, and those of you who fear God, it is to us that the message of this salvation has been sent!"

[89] James H. Winans and Hoyt H. Hudson, A First Course in Public Speaking (New York: The Century Company, 1925), p. 93.

[90] Ephesians 2:12.

[91] Zechariah 8:23.

[92] The following sketch of synagogue sermons is abbreviated from J. W. Bowker's "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yellammedenu Form," New Testament Studies, 25 (October, 1967), pp. 96-104.

[93] For added interest, see Lester Thonssen and Craig A. Baird's standards in Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948), p. 361.

[94] Cf. Max Wilcox, The Semitisms of Acts, pp. 22, 23.

[95] Cicero De Oratore, trans. E. W. Sutton, Loeb Classical Library, ed. James Loeb (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), 1. 167.

[96] Cicero De Oratore, 21.69.

[97] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1958), p. 137.

[98] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, p. 154.

[99] Cicero De Partitione Oratoria, trans. H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948), 2. 7.

[100] See verses 33 and 34 also; reference is here to God's raising up Jesus as Messiah in the sense in which He raised up David as King (vs. 22). In Hebrew history, the day of the King's anointing was ideally the day in which he, as the nation's representative, was born into a new relation of sonship toward Jehovah. (F. H. Chase, The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles [London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1902], p. 214).

[101] Cicero De Oratore, 1. 31. 143.

[102] Cicero De Oratore, 1. 89.

[103] Quintilian, The Institutio Oratoria, trans. H. E. Butler, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 2. 13. 2. 7. 15.

[104] Quintilian, Institutes of Oratory, trans. J. S. Watson (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1903), 4. 1. 52.

[105] Cicero De Oratore, 2. 330.

[106] Cicero De Oratore, 2. 330. Cf. Cicero De Inventione, trans. H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library, ed. James Loeb (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), 1. 30.

[107] Quintilian, Institutes of Oratory, 4. 2. 31.

[108] Quintilian, 4. 1. 52.

[109] Aristotle, The "Art" of Rhetoric, trans. John Henry Freese, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), 1. 2.

[110] For a discussion of these five standards, see Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 336.

[111] Donald Lemen Clark, Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), pp. 117, 118.

[112] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, 4. 20. 147.

[113] Quintilian, Institutes of Oratory, 5. 14. 27, 32.

[114] Cicero De Oratore, 11. 40.

[115] Aristotle, The "Art" of Rhetoric, 2. 18.

[116] See Romans 8:2 and Acts 13:33-39.

[117] Aristotle, Rhetoric and Poetics, trans. W. Rhys Roberts and Ingram Bywater, ed. Friedrich Solmsen (New York: Random House, Inc., 1954), pp. 31-34; Cicero De Oratore, 1. 90.

[118] Aristotle, p. 35.

[119] Aristotle, pp. 31-34; Cicero De Oratore, 1. 90.

[120] Cicero De Oratore, 2. 334; cf. Quintilian, Institutes of Oratory, 3. 8. 1.

[121] Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, pp. 394, 395.

[122] Thonssen and Baird, p. 361.

[123] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, trans. Harry Caplan, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), 4. 11.

[124] Cited in Selected Readings in Rhetoric and Public Speaking, ed. Lester Thonssen (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1942), p. 175.

[125] Thonssen, Selected Readings in Rhetoric and Public Speaking, pp. 175, 176.

[126] Thonssen, p. 251.

[127] Hugh Blair, Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres (London: W. Strahan, T. Cadell in the Strand; and W. Creech, in Edinburgh, 1833), 2. 2.

[128] Longinus(?), On Great Writing (On the Sublime), trans. G. M. A. Grube (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1957), pp. 8, 9.

[129] George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963), p. 275.

[130] Cicero De Oratore, 3. 37; cf. Quintilian, Institutes of Oratory, 7. 1-11. 1.

[131] Cicero De Oratore, 3. 37.

[132] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, 4. 133.

[133] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, 4. 19.

[134] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, 4. 59-62; Cicero De Oratore, 3. 205; Cicero, Orator, trans. H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), p. 138.

[135] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, 4. 53.

[136] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, 4. 51.

[137] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, 4. 68.

[138] There is a convenient list in Wilkin's edition of *De Oratore*, 1. 62-64.

[139] See Cicero *De Inventione*, trans. H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), 1. 7. 9; Cicero, *Brutus*, trans. G. L. Hendrickson, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 9. 34, 17. 37, 55, 142, and 80. 278; Cicero, *Orator*, 17. 55-18; 60; Cicero *De Officiis*, trans. C. W. Keyes, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 1. 37. 133; Cicero *De Oratore*, 1. 61. 261; 2. 19. 70; and 3. 56. 213-60. 60. 227.

[140] Cicero *De Oratore*, 2. 89.

[141] Cicero *De Oratore*, 2. 47. 49. 201.

[142] Cicero, *Orator*, 49. 100-101; cf. Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 12. 10. 58.

[143] John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae; Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1909), pp. 204-207.

[144] F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1951), p. 265.

[145] R. J. Knowling, "The Acts of the Apostles," *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1961), 2. 293.

[146] Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, pp. 118-120.

[147] Wilcox, pp. 127, 128, 163.

[148] Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 51-53.

[149] Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, pp. 90, 91.

[150] Saint Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, 4. 4. 121.

[151] Hugh Blair, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, 2. 28, 29.

[152] Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 3, preface 25.

[153] Ferdinand S. Schenck, *The Oratory and Poetry of the Bible* (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1915), p. 21.

[154] See Blair's standards for good style, in Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, 2. 28, 29.

[155] Cicero De Oratore, p. 23.

[156] See Acts 13:39-49 and Habakkuk 1:5.

[157] Ricciotti, The Acts of the Apostles: Text and Commentary, pp. 206, 207.

[158] Cicero, Orator, 69. 11, 101.

[159] Quintilian, Institutes of Oratory, 11. 3. 174.

[160] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, 4. 18. 145.

[161] Saint Augustine, De Doctrina Christiana, trans. J. F. Shaw, ed. Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids: Wm. G. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), 4. 22. 159.

[162] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, 4. 26. 163.

[163] Cicero De Oratore, 1. 100-103.

[164] Cicero, Orator, 126, 130, 132; Brutus, 89, 279.

[165] For a confirmation of this pro-Judaic tone, see Eldon Jay Epp, The Theological Tendency of Codes Bezae Cantabrigionsis in Acts, Vol. 3, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, ed. Matthew Black (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1966), p. 95.

[166] Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 358.

[167] L. H. Mouat, "Approach to Rhetorical Criticism," The Rhetorical Idiom, ed. Donald C. Bryant (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1958), pp. 171, 172. The total quote from Mouat is well worth reciting here:

> If the many rhetorical concepts that produce effectiveness, as well as the area of effectiveness, can be reduced and simplified, and if we can approach an isomorphic, or one-to-one relationship between the speaker and his speech, on the one hand, and the audience (area of effect) on the other, our search for a unifying medium of criticism will be ended. We now propose that the common denominator of rhetorical concepts that produce effectiveness may be conceived of as a form of identification, as defined by Kenneth Burke, and that an isomorphic relationship can be established between societal orders and methods of identification.

[168] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, 3. 15. 27.

[169] Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, 11. 3. 123.

[170] Irving J. Lee, "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal in Rhetorical Theory," Speech Monographs, VI (1939), 85.

[171] Kathleen Jamieson, "The Rhetorical Manifestations of Weltanschauung," Central States Speech Journal, 32, No. 1 (Spring, 1976), 4.

[172] Jamieson, p. 4.

[173] James A. Winans and H. H. Hudson, A First Course in Public Speaking, p. 121.

[174] William Macpherson, The Psychology of Persuasion (New York: Methuen and Co., 1920), p. 149.

[175] Austin Phelps, cited by Winans and Hudson, A First Course in Public Speaking, p. 142.

[176] Winans and Hudson, p. 199.

CHAPTER IV

THE RHETORIC OF AMOS

The Apostle Paul preached, "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His son."[1] However, Paul did not preach this until God had used various methods, and many years, in preparing a congregation to receive His message. Paul observed that "when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son . . ."[2] One of the prophets who helped to "fulfil" the time was Amos.

Amos was a pioneer religious speaker who demonstrated the oral aspects of Hebrew rhetoric. From his utterances as one who employed the art of persuasion, it is possible to discover practices which characterize his speaking. For most revealing results, however, the speeches of Amos cannot be studied without giving consideration to the total speech situation: the historical setting, the Biblical exposition including the theme, the structure of the speech, and the arrangement and development of ideas with emphasis upon logos; and the rhetorical analysis, including the response to the message, its adaptation to the audience and occasion, its structure, its style, and ethos and pathos.

The Historical Setting

Amos came from the wilderness of Tekoa, south of Jerusalem, with a message for the city-dwellers of Israel. His name signifies more than "carrier," the usual meaning attached to it. The word which is translated "Amos" is associated in meaning with the terms "heavy" or "burden" because of the nature of his message.[3] His work as a herdsman and orchardman was interrupted when he was called by God to "Go prophesy." The urgency of his call is indicated by his vehement declarations, his stern warnings, and his bold manner.

Amos and Hosea addressed congregations living in the same vicinity. While their ministry was directed to a very small part of Syria, yet the influence of their messages was no doubt felt throughout the entire country. Never during the time that Amos preached did his congregation control a territory more than 150 miles long and 75 miles wide. It was about the size and shape of the State of Vermont. Paul, the Apostle, later says of this place, and concerning the pagan King Agrippa: "I do not believe any of it has escaped his notice, for this was not done in a corner."[4] Palestine in Syria, forming the east coast of the Mediterranean Sea, and lying between Asia Minor on the north and Arabia in the south, was truly the crossroads of the world. It was to this prominent place that God sent Amos to be one of His preachers, to prepare a people for the coming of a Savior into the world.

Many scholars since Jerome have asserted that Amos was a provincial, unlettered rustic. On the other hand, others insist that there is no stronger or purer literary style in the entire Old Testament,[5] and that Amos was master of his native language. The Hebrew language is limited to about 2,000 root words and approximately 10,000 vocabulary words, as compared to 100,000 in Greek and over 500,000 in English.[6] Amos used the limited Hebrew vocabulary most effectively.

While it cannot be said that Amos was highly educated in a formal sense, he did reveal general knowledge and a type of practical wisdom. He was acquainted with the traditions and history of his own people, citing illustrations and examples from his own culture[7] and from those nations surrounding the Hebrews.[8] His nature passages[9] reveal one who has been educated by spending time alone meditating under the stars. In his day, knowledge and oratory were not affairs of professional training, but superior culture often accompanied the poverty of Eastern shepherd life. Men of all ranks mingled freely without regard to wealth or social status. Intellectual preeminence was gained by shrewd observation, a memory of traditional lore, the faculty of original reflection, and constructive meditation.[10] Amos lived on the fringe of the fertile crescent near the caravan crossroads of three continents, where world travelers passed. He knew about Edom and Moab; and Gaza, Tyre, and Damascus are foreign cities mentioned in his opening speech. He was not a hermit, for it appears that, like many shepherds, he travelled--as a wool merchant in season, or perhaps in some other line of duty. The least that can be said is that his writings show some familiarity with nations, their origins, their cultures, their geography, their character and their morals.

It is not easy to give exact dates to the preaching ministry of Amos. However, his dates may be approximated by a certain statement in the first verse of his book: "The words of Amos . . . in the days of Uzziah, King of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash King of Israel, two years before the earthquake."[11] While the date of the earthquake was probably known in the time of Amos, present-day scholars know nothing definite about it. No one is certain when Uzziah began his reign over Judah. Some very good authorities hold that he began to reign between 790 B.C. and 772 B.C., under the name of Azariah, and that his name was changed after his daring intrusion into the sanctuary, when he was smitten with leprosy.[12] At this time also, Jothan became a co-regent with him. This reign lasted until Uzziah's death in 738 B.C., and in 735 B.C., Jotham was succeeded by Ahaz who reigned until the ascension of Hezekiah in 720 B.C.

In the Northern Kingdom it is much easier to define dates. During the entire ministry of Amos, and the beginning of that of Hosea, there was but one king in Israel: Jeroboam II, the son of Joash. He reigned from about 783 B.C., to 743 B.C. In studying the social situation of that day one is led to believe that Jeroboam II had been on the throne some time before the voice of Amos was heard in the king's sanctuary. It is very probable that the public preaching of Amos took place during the second quarter of the eighth century before Christ.

When Amos left the wilderness bordering the western side of the Dead Sea to find an audience in Israel he passed through the village of Bethlehem five miles north of Tekoa, continuing to the fortified city of Jerusalem. This had been the seat of Judah's government since David's day.

Amos probably delivered his first sermon in the northern capital city of Samaria which had been built by Omri.[13] Elaborate fortifications with a water supply stored in great cisterns made the city such a citadel that its populace boasted that they were able to withstand a siege by the mightiest armies.

The stage was set for Amos by the hewn houses, the crowds at the elaborate religious celebrations, the marketplace, the mock trials at the gate, the wicked rich and the proud women. He saw sermon illustrations in every area of urban life. Elisha had been dead fewer than 50 years, but the simple society of his day was gone. Rapidly expanding city life with its quick wealth, and at the same time equally increasing poverty, had come to Israel.[14]

The Political Setting

In the eighth century B.C., the little nation of Israel was a comparative newcomer among the peoples of the Near East. Israel had been led by David and Solomon to prominence among the great fluctuating empires of ancient origin which surrounded her, but before the eighth century the nation had gone into a decline, and the kingdom of Israel and Judah had been divided. Under the Omri dynasty and particularly under the notorious Ahab, the Northern Kingdom had become strong and prosperous, and Judah as a subject partner had shared in this prosperity. On the overthrow of this dynasty there had followed another period of decline.

> The Aramaean kingdom, with its capital at Damascus, had overrun a good part of Israel's territory (II Kings 10:32, 33) and pressed to the very gates of Jerusalem, laying that city under tribute (II Kings 12:17, 18). But just after the turn of the century, the great Assyrian Empire, which had long been threatening to make itself master of western Asia and engulf the little kingdoms in Syria and Palestine, again advanced westward, and in 802 B.C., reduced Damascus and so weakened that state that Israel was once more able to assert itself victoriously (II Kings 13:25). The withdrawal of Assyria from the West because of weakness at home left Israel free to develop its resources: under Jeroboam II the small kingdom enjoyed its third and last period of prosperity.[15]

There was an uneasy peace since Jeroboam II had led Israel to military achievements which had resulted in some territorial expansion. National joy and gladness were aroused by economic opportunity, but the earthquake,[16] the eclipse of 763 B.C., the pestilence of 765 B.C., and the threats of greedy neighbors also aroused anxiety. There was an unhappy remembrance of the Syrians along with the recent treatment by the Ammonites.[17]

Amos was as interested in political affairs as were the earlier prophets, but he had neither special relation to the king, official standing in the government, nor traditional political influences. He was a private citizen who sought to arouse Israel to national and personal action. He interpreted Assyria's relation to the world and demonstrated political sagacity in his analysis of the political setting.

The political history of Jeroboam's reign is found in the Second Book of Kings.[18] It is strange that such a long and prosperous reign should take so small a place in written history. The reign of Jeroboam in Israel lasted for 41 years, during which time the kingdom was extended even beyond the limits at the close of Solomon's reign. Jeroboam conquered many of the cities and districts lost to his immediate predecessors, taking not only Damascus on the north, but far off Hamath on the Orontes. A statement in the prophecy of Amos bears this out:

> For, behold, I will raise up against you a nation, O house of Israel, saith Jehovah, the God of hosts; and they shall afflict you from the entrance of Hamath unto the brook of the Arabah.[19]

Farrar points out that the Kingdom of Jeroboam:

. . . reached to the Wady of the Arabah, the torrent of

> Willows, which divided Moab from Edom. (Isaiah xv:7). Moab had fallen under his sway. Moab had acknowledged the sovereignty of Israel in former times, and had paid heavy tribute of sheep and lambs; but it had revolted and regained its independence after the death of Ahab. It was now re-subdued.[20]

From a political and imperial point of view, Jeroboam's reign was a complete success. He was limited only by the mountains in the north, and Egypt on the south. Even Judah was counted as a vassal, and many foreign districts paid tribute. Apparently prosperity and power had come to the chosen people to stay. There was nothing within or without to indicate otherwise. But when such a condition exists, and the leaders of the day cannot see the dangers ahead, doom is certain. Farrar observes:

> When Papal Rome seemed to have the world at her feet, and priests stood at the altar of St. Peter's raking into their coffers the uncounted gold of the pilgrims who flocked to the great Jubilee of 1300, Pope Boniface VIII was within three years of the day when he received at Anagni that cruel blow upon the cheek from which it may be said that the dignity of the Papacy has never wholly recovered.[21]

Because of such a situation in Israel, the brilliant reign of Jeroboam and the prosperity of the eighth century has been called by one writer, "Israel's Indian Summer."[22]

The Social Setting

When the Hebrews crossed the Jordan River, the *mishpat* (manner, custom) of the nomad shepherd in the desert was displaced by the *mishpat* of the peasant in agricultural civilization on the sown land. Property began to be valued above personality, until one could say, "the poor are sold for a pair of shoes."[23] The developing of urban life with the emergence of civic culture exposed the nation to those dangers of materialism associated with rapidly acquired wealth. Commerce with its extended intercourse among foreign powers increased prosperity and the desire for prestige, while it decreased the sensitivity to social injustice. Religious zeal was expressed by liberal sacrifices, but faith in God became for many a good-luck charm without moral implications or social responsibility.

By the middle of the eighth century B.C., Israel was a thriving commercial society. Success was considered essential at all costs, whether those costs were lavish sacrifices, religious bigotry, social cruelty, court bribery, murder, or common thievery. Men were but chattels in the struggle to gain greater economic plenty.

Small landowners were dispossessed by those whose goal was the building of large country estates surrounding their summer "houses of ivory." When the middle-class Israelite went out to defend his home, he either died on the battlefield or returned weakened and impoverished. Forays by nomadic neighbors destroyed his crops, thus curtailing his already meager income. Then his mortgage which was held by the nobles was foreclosed, to bring the loss of home, land, and freedom. Bribery in the courts, which were presided over by the rich, shut off justice. The small upper-class were exuberant, but the masses suffered in silence. Those in the middle class were largely reduced to serfdom, while the newly rich in commerce transferred their winter homes to the capital or to the larger cities, where they built mansions of hewn stone and marble. In brief, "special class privilege, misuse of authority, unjust distribution of the burden of taxation, and the iniquitous exploitation of the masses were the evils which called forth the Hebrew prophets of the eighth century."[24] In the words of Amos:

> . . . they sold the righteous for silver
> and the poor for a pair of shoes;
> that pant after the dust of the earth on the
> head of the poor,
> and turn aside the way of the meek:
> and a man and his father will go in unto the
> same maid,
> to profane my holy name.
> For they know not to do right, saith the Lord,
> Who store up violence and robbery in their palaces.
> Ye that put far away the evil day,
> and cause the seat of violence to come near;
> That lie upon beds of ivory,
> and stretch themselves upon their couches,
> and eat the lambs out of the flock,
> and the calves out of the midst of the stall;
> That chant to the sound of the viol,
> and invent to themselves instruments of musick
> like David;
> That drink wine in bowls,
> and anoint themselves with the chief ointments:
> but they are not grieved for the affliction of
> Joseph.[25]

There apparently was no distinct class of judges in eighth-century Israel. In each town or city the elders and nobles sat as officials of royalty, serving as judges. The King himself sat in judgment as the supreme court of the land, to decide all civil disputes that were appealed. Corrupt leaders perverted justice by exacting their own price.[26] At the gate where court was held, Amos may have heard the sighs of a people once free, the mutterings of men who were once content and secure. He may have heard boasts of prosperity above the sound of slaves' hammers building large houses of hewn stone on newly acquired country estates. It seems that the prophet appeared in a surprise debut at a patriotic rally in Israel's capital city of Samaria. There he preached the first sermons of his book (Chapters 1-3). Amos saw the entire social situation, with its pride, greed, physical plenty, and inner poverty, erupting in immoral behavior which he interpreted as signs of decay and approaching death.

The Religious Setting

The Hebrew prophets were religious speakers, and the Hebrew nation was central in every concept of religion as taught by them or practiced by the people of the eighth century B.C. Popular religion contributed a spirit of optimism; the Hebrews felt that they were the favored worshippers of a powerful God who guaranteed fertility and fruitfulness to all who offered sacrifices. While many of the religious leaders of the day insisted on ceremonialism with the strict demands of mechanical rites, the prophets insisted that the God of all peoples demanded moral conduct. The principle of personal moral responsibility began to receive sharper emphasis as the prophets charged the leaders with dereliction of duty.

If one had been privileged to enter the sanctuary at Bethel, or the places of worship in Gilgal and Dan, he would have been impressed by the paganism of their worship. One may read all the historical records available regarding the religion of the Northern Kingdom in the eighth century, and still see little difference between those Israelites and the pagan people of that time. Even when the books of Amos and Hosea are read, one is surprised at the lack of uniqueness in their religious practices. "Come to Bethel and transgress; to Gilgal, and multiply transgression."[27]

This is enough to show the religious trend of those to whom Amos spoke. The Kingdom of Israel, sometimes called Ephraim, had enjoyed the privilege of being the chosen people of God. From the time God called Abraham to make of him a great nation, He had protected and led that nation into riches and abundance of life. God never left it without witnesses, and even Abraham was called a prophet: "for he is a prophet and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live."[28]

The fact that Israel was to have prophets at all times[29] implies that the priesthood was not sufficient to provide for the spiritual oversight and direction of God's people. This was the case when Amos preached at Bethel,[30] and will always be the case when religion becomes static. The religious program which Moses delivered to the Hebrews had practically degenerated into a pagan cult when Amos stepped onto the rostrum. It is stated in the short account of Jeroboam's reign that "he did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah: he departed not from all the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, wherewith he made Israel to sin."[31] The period covered by the reign of Jeroboam II (son of Joash) is marked by a continuation of the unnatural and anti-Jehovistic institutions which were inaugurated by his namesake and the founder of the Israelitish monarchy, Jeroboam I, son of Nebat. It seems that, in order to keep his newly acquired constituency from the habit of going to Jerusalem for worship and annual feasting, Jeroboam I established places of worship known as high places, in Dan and Bethel. Thus, he was doing his people a favor by bringing their religion to their own door. Concerning this, Willett says:

> The popular religion was of a low and formal character, and it is difficult at times to be sure whether the description is that of the degraded Jehovah worship which resulted from the erection of the images by Jeroboam, or of the heathen customs that crept in (Amos 2:12; 4:4f; 5:21; 8:5). In such an age it was necessary that a strong voice be lifted in protest against the spirit of the times and in defense of righteousness.[32]

Amos found the elite religious class lying around the altars on cloaks which had been wrenched from the poor, and drinking wine unjustly taken from the needy.[33] Even though their degenerate worship was an amalgamation of several pagan practices and gods, especially of Baal, the Israelites still ascribed it to Jehovah, and pretended to worship Him.

> As long as the rulers brought rich sacrifices to the sanctuaries and faithfully met the demands of the ritual, they felt sure of Jehovah's favor and protection. Though the very offerings they brought to Jehovah had been wrested from their fellow countrymen by injustice and oppression, they felt confident that all was well, since Jehovah was prospering them. Even at the great religious festivals there were gluttony, drunkenness, and immorality; and yet they believed that by the splendour of their ritual they were purchasing Jehovah's continued favor. The poor, who had no such offerings to bring, must have felt indeed that Heaven was against them.[34]

Canaanite magical practices were vehemently denounced by Amos[35] because he felt that if these practices were allowed in the Lord's temple they would sound the knell of true religion. A blind confidence in ceremonialism gave a false sense of security along with a sadistic callousness toward inhuman cruelty. The nation, insane with the initial thrill of indulgence, revealed the inner poverty of a people who had once known the disciplines of God and the desert. As worshippers flocked to Gilgal and Bethel for the elaborate services, they seemingly seldom remembered the God they had followed in the wilderness, or their Hebrew heritage. Yet they remembered war, famine, thirst, poverty, plunder, pestilence, earthquake, and eclipse, and they thought they must try to bribe Jehovah with elaborate worship while they also made deals with pagan gods.

When Amos came to deliver his sermons at Bethel, the central seat of calf worship, there was ultimately a dramatic encounter of prophet with priest. A long history had made Bethel a sacred spot since Abraham had visited the place.[36] Jacob, fleeing from Essau, had had a vision of a ladder reaching to Heaven there, and the next morning, as he anointed the stone which he had used as a pillow, he had called the place the "house of God."[37] Bethel thereafter had been regarded in a special way as the dwelling place of deity.[38]

Word of the coming of Amos to the King's chapel caused Amaziah, the King's chaplain, to come out and meet the prophet. Prospects of success for Amos seemed ruined with the first words of the priest: "You begging seer, go back home to Judah to earn your bread."[39] As might be expected, Amaziah saw treason in the coming of Amos. Previous prophecies against the house of Omri were not forgotten. The speeches of Amos might stir up some of the worshippers, so that it was necessary to silence him.

However, Amos defended himself: "I am no prophet or one trying to solicit reward or popular acclaim; I am sent by God."[40] "The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord God hath spoken; who can but prophesy?"[41]

Amos was one of a very few who, while preaching, could say, "I am no prophet, no member of any prophets' guild."[42] From the time of Samuel the prophets of Jehovah existed in organized bands known as schools or guilds.[43] The prophetic bands received daily sustenance because of their profession. Even if most of them were insincere, that was not true of them all; but it was natural that they should prophesy good concerning their paymaster, and, it seems, that was usually required. Here was a dilemma for Amos. He had a stirring message from God to the people of the Northern Kingdom, Israel, but how should he present it? If he went to Jeroboam the king, or to Amaziah the priest, and told of his visions together with the coming destruction of Samaria, he would be laughed out of Bethel. If he joined the prophetic band he would be instructed to agree with them and to prophesy good concerning the king. Therefore, he decided to appear as a lone preacher, and finally stand before the Bethel shrine. There he was not only accused of conspiracy against the king of Israel, but he was linked with the professional prophets who prophesied for their living. Thus, he was told, "O thou seer, go, flee thou away into the land of Judah, and there eat . . . , and prophesy there: but prophesy not again any more at Bethel: for it is the king's sanctuary and it is a royal house."[44] This was indeed an indictment of Amos. He lived in the land of Judah, a land unclean and full of injustices. Why should he come to this "House of God" (Beth-el) to reform it when his own house needed cleaning? But the facts, as they were, sufficiently answered this condemnation, and Amos spoke the truth to Amaziah the priest, saying, "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son; but I was a herdsman and a dresser of sycamore trees: and Jehovah took me from following the flock, and Jehovah said unto me, 'Go, prophesy unto my people

Israel.'"[45]

Speaking over the protests of the priest, Amos told of the basket of summer fruit he saw in his fourth vision.[46] Then he pictured God standing beside the altar at Bethel, calling for its destruction, with the temple crashing down upon the crowd that worshipped there, followed by widespread destruction. Bethel is doomed, for Israel shall fall in spite of her religious displays.

The Biblical Exposition

The Text of the Sermons

The text of the sermons of Amos will be referred to under different headings of discussion, and quoted in appropriate contexts. The book itself is too long to be quoted here.

The Content and Organization of the Sermons

The writings of Amos constitute the oldest book of sermons extant. There seem to be ten discourses by Amos in the book, although it is possible to find as many as 14 different speeches. What content of ideas and general structure is to be found in these addresses?

The Theme and Purpose of the Sermons.--With the exception of a few instances, Amos has no place for a gospel of mercy. His message is based upon the ethical impartiality of God's justice. The theme of his message is "Let justice run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."

> I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer me your burnt offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.[47]

The cry of Amos is the Voice of Jehovah.

In Hebrew poetry the style of this passage would be called "synonymous parallelism," because the second line repeats the thought of the first with slight variations only. Therefore, it is clear that Amos uses "justice" as almost synonymous with "righteousness." The righteousness of God demands that He be a just God. This is seen many times in the message of Amos, notably after he condemns the "kine of Bashan" that are worshipping at Bethel and at the same time oppressing the poor. "The Lord Jehovah hath sworn by his holiness, that, lo, the days shall come upon you, that they shall take you away with hooks, and your residue with fish-hooks."[48] To Amos justice can be achieved only as those guilty of sin are punished for their guilt.

For Amos the laws of life teach the ethical impartiality of God's justice which cannot be perverted by any considerations of favor. These are the fighting words, this is the foreign idea which Amos declares to his hearers when he states that God cares for other nations as much as He cares for Israel. Amos believes that right makes might, not the reverse. When he says that righteous or ethical behavior counts, in his severe strength he has little sympathy for weakness or deviation. Some have gone so far as to say:

> Little hope to relieve the gloom, little faith in the God of mercy, Who forgives and heals because of His infinite compassion, no trace of cheer, no inkling of a sense of humor--a grave fault which Amos shared with the rest of the prophets--no doubt in his own convictions mitigates the pronouncements of Amos. Hard, harsh, mercilessly dogmatic, he hurls denunciation at an unjust society and its flunkies. Uncompromising justice--that is the greatness and the weakness of Amos.[49]

Amos is unexcelled as a prosecutor of Israel's sin. A second theme, found first in the second verse of the first chapter, and which runs through all his discourse, is the warning roar of descending punishment and doom: "Jehovah will roar from Zion and utter His voice from Jerusalem; and the pastures of the shepherds shall mourn, and the top of Carmel shall wither."

Yet the heart of his message is not in negations or a rigid schedule of privation, but rather in a constructive course of ethical morality. There is a positive element even in his declarations of doom, because he cites specific reasons why punishment is certain, instead of listing a large number of prohibitions. He calls for a return to an upright life as he points to a positive course of action:

> Seek good, and not evil, that ye may live: and so the Lord, the God of hosts, shall be with you, as ye have spoken. Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish judgment in the gate: It may be that the Lord God of hosts will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph. . . . let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.[50]

Amos is possessed by one purpose: to cause Israel to return to God. He speaks as the Voice of Jehovah, in a negative vein, to show them this purpose:

> "And I also have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places; yet ye have not returned unto Me, saith Jehovah. And I also have withholden the rain from you, when there were yet three months to the harvest; and I caused it to rain upon one city, and caused it not to rain upon another city: one piece was rained upon, and the piece whereupon it rained not withered. So two or three cities wandered unto one city to drink water, and were not satisfied: yet have ye not returned unto Me, saith Jehovah. I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt: your young men have I slain with the sword, and have carried away your horses; and I have made the stench of your camp to come up even into your nostrils: yet have ye not returned unto Me, saith Jehovah. I have overthrown cities among you, as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, and ye were as a brand plucked out of the burning: yet have ye not returned unto Me, saith Jehovah."[51]

It is the purpose of Amos to see that Israel should live and act as God desires. However, it is not in his plans that he should become king of Israel, or even priest, in order that his goal might be realized. He has become a prophet only to make the desires of Jehovah known. His life is not to be given to establishing an ideal state by force, but to inspire the people and leaders with the vision which is his. It is not in Amos' purpose to destroy the Mosaic ritual nor, as some have thought,[52] to establish a new religion which was later to be known as Judaism. Religion must function outside the sanctuary as well as within. It is not his purpose to try to centralize the Hebrews in their worship; it is his purpose to centralize their worship in an objective God. Juenen and Smith observe that "the antithesis suggested by . . . Amos . . . is not between the worship on high places and worship at Jerusalem, but between high places and the true service of Jehovah, showing that it was not the unity of the sanctuary but purity of worship which they had in heart."[53]

The force of his purpose directs the message of Amos not only against social injustices of his day, but against the prevailing religion and worship of Israel:

> Come to Beth-el, and transgress; to Gilgal, and multiply transgression; and bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes every three days; and offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving of that which is leavened, and proclaim freewill-offerings and punish them: for this pleaseth you, O ye children of Israel, saith the Lord Jehovah.[54]

The truth of this satire on their religion is mitigated with the following provision, which plainly infers that spiritual adultery--idolatry--is bondage, futility, death.

> For thus saith Jehovah unto the house of Israel, Seek ye me and ye shall live; but seek not Beth-el, nor enter into Gilgal, and pass not to Beer-sheba: Beth-el shall come to naught. Seek Jehovah and ye shall live.[55]

Obedience to the call of the Lord will fulfill the purpose of Jehovah and His prophet. The message is God's, and not that of Amos.

Structure and Outline of the Sermons.--We can distinguish with more than ordinary certainty the outlines of the individual addresses; and the arrangement of the book is fairly clear. The text, also, has been on the whole faithfully preserved; and though in a few places critics profess to find the traces of later editing., this conclusion rests mainly on subjective grounds, being estimated differently by different minds.

The book can be outlined as follows:

Superscription 1:1 "The words of Amos . . . concerning Israel."

Introduction: "The Lord will roar from Zion and utter His voice . . . and the top of Carmel shall wither."

- I. Prophecies against the nation. 1:3-2:16.
    - A. Indictment of neighboring nations. 1:3-2:3.
    - B. Indictment of Judah. 2:4, 5.
    - C. Indictment of Israel. 2:6-16.
- II. Three sermons against Israel. 3:1-6:14.
    - A. A declaration of judgment. 3:1-15.
    - B. The depravity of Israel. 4:1-13.
    - C. A lamentation for Israel's sin and doom. 5:1-6:14.

Theme

Let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.

- III. Five visions of Israel's condition. 7:1-9:10.
    - A. The devouring locusts. 7:1-3.
    - B. The flaming fire. 7:4-6.
    - C. The plumb line. 7:7-9.
    - D. Ecclesiastical opposition. 7:10-17.
    - E. The basket of ripe fruit. 8:1-14.
    - F. The judgment of the Lord. 9:1-10.
- IV. The promise of Israel's restoration. 9:11-15.

Conclusion: Full kingdom blessing of restored Israel.

Arrangement and Development of Ideas with Emphasis Upon Logos.--The first speech in the book of Amos comprises the opening two chapters in which Amos announces judgment on surrounding nations before he startles his audience by threatening Judah[56] and Israel.[57]

The second discourse, beginning with the formula, "Hear this word," brings the message of the lion's roar to Israel. In this sermon, apparently delivered in the capital city of Samaria,[58] Amos says that the family of Israel so carefully brought out of Egypt must be punished for ingratitude. Israel will become a remnant like bits of a lamb which are rescued from a lion.

Chapter IV, also beginning with "Hear this word," is addressed to the women of Samaria.[59] The idle wives are called fat cows as Amos charges that they should relieve the misery of their unfortunate neighbors instead of feeding their own animal appetites and inciting the men to inhumanities. The first three verses seem to summarize the statements which he addresses to the ladies.[60]

The last ten verses of Chapter IV constitute the fourth discourse which condemns the religious observances at Gilgal and Bethel. Famine, drought, pests, pestilence, fire, and burnings are attributed to the hand of Jehovah before the prophet threatens even greater calamity and then exhorts, "Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel."[61]

The fifth speech as given in Chapter V threatens Israel with falling down helplessly; admonishes them to seek the Lord for real life; indicts them for injustices; and invites them to seek good and not evil, that they might live in the favor of Jehovah.[62]

The day of the Lord is the theme for the sixth speech.[63] Here, Amos denounces the feasts, sacrifices, and solemn assemblies of the people; he exhorts them to let judgment run down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream, lest the God of hosts cause them to go into captivity beyond Damascus.

In the sixth chapter,[64] the seventh sermon is recorded with its detailed accusations of Israel's indulgence which shall bring captivity and pestilence. Because they have "turned judgment into gall, and the fruit of righteousness into hemlock," Jehovah shall raise up a nation against Israel.

At Bethel Amos seems to gather up the essential elements of his previous speeches. The eighth discourse[65] refers to visions of grasshoppers, fire, and the plumbline. The record of altercation between prophet and priest is given with direct discourse and violent threats in the remainder of the chapter.[66]

The ninth sermon[67] deals with the fourth vision--the basket of summer fruit. The quick decay of the overripe fruit is compared with Israel's fate of famine, sorrow, and death in foreign captivity.

The tenth and perhaps final sermon,[68] opens with the fifth vision of God standing at Bethel's altar bringing its destruction with the collapse of the temple. Some scholars feel that the sermons of Amos terminate with the words:

"Behold the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth."[69] The reason given for this inference is that Amos is supposed to be the prophet of doom rather than of deliverance.

The conclusion of the book is a glowing promise of restoration based upon Israel's repentance. Some feel that this section has been added later to soften the foregoing message of destruction, but there are many examples throughout the Old and New Testaments where good and evil with their consequences are sharply contrasted by being considered in proximity. This is common practice among the prophets; frequently he who portrays the brighest future for the upright also depicts the darkest outlook for the unrighteous.

While the order of each sentence in the book of Amos cannot be cited with certainty, the view of many scholars may be summarized by the statement that "the genuineness of the bulk of the book of Amos is not doubted by any critic."[70] Some recent scholars, however, tend to follow in the direction of R. E. Wolfe's views, holding that only about half of the book as it now stands can belong to Amos. Others wonder "if it is necessary to deal so radically with the text as some have done. To reject a verse, for example, because we do not see the connection, is surely arbitrary. . . ."[71] This dissection of the book of Amos "has been carried to an extent which represents rather the ingenuity of a few critics than the settled consensus of the majority."[72]

Amos sees social offenses on the international, national, and local levels. He raises his voice against extortion,[73] immorality,[74] corruption of cities,[75] class inequality and oppression,[76] wasteful luxury,[77] and priests who oppose the prophetic ministry.[78] He also condemns the perversion of justice and partiality of judges;[79] the substitution of mechanics and magic for personal relationship with God;[80] the national pride of special privilege and the blind, baseless hope that no evil will ever come.[81]

A progressive advance is obvious in the speech of Amos. For example, he leads his Israelite audience to first consider the transgressions of others including Judah. He enumerates their own unjust expressions of ingratitude without any threat of recompense, until he has reached his conclusion. He moves repeatedly from yesterday's favors to today's ingratitude and on to the consequences of the future. Sometimes he fails to remind his hearers of their heritage, but he never fails to proceed from today's behavior as a cause to the judgments of tomorrow as an effect.

Amos differs from the desert dwelling Rechabites and Nazarites[82] in that he does not lament the progressive shifts from a nomadic to an agrarian to a mercantile life. He does not condemn culture. Instead of calling Israel back to the old days, he condemns the nation for its unscrupulous principles. He insists that no civilization can survive without the undergirding of justice. Even the nation that calls itself the chosen of God cannot long endure without either repentance or retribution. He gives only one solution--untrammeled justice. He says that God is just. Let every nation, every man be upright.

Amos deals more with Israel's sin against her fellows, while Hosea directs his message more against her sin against the oneness of God. To Amos, justice is a moral issue, and the sin of injustice will alienate one from God as quickly as idolatry or blasphemy.

The message of Amos may be taken apart and put under four topics: (1) many nations have sinned, the chief sinner of which is Israel; (2) sin invariably brings punishment; (3) Israel must repent in order that; (4) a remnant shall be saved. Amos thinks a remnant will be saved only because there will be some who will repent. All the sinners who remain sinners will perish. Perhaps the best statement of his attitude is found in the last chapter of his message:

> Behold, the eyes of the Lord Jehovah are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; save that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith Jehovah. For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all the nations, like as grain is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least kernel fall upon the earth. All the sinners of my people shall die by the sword, who say, The evil shall not overtake nor meet us.[83]

Those who give no attention to the preacher's message of impending judgment are not concerned enough to repent of their evil ways. Therefore, the day of Jehovah will come, but it will not be as they expect; they desire light, but it will be darkness for them. A house will be full of men and perhaps all will perish. In another house one man might be found alive with many corpses. So terrible will be the experience even for those who form the remnant, that the name of Jehovah must not be mentioned, for it is He that commandeth and causeth judgment to come.[84]

The message of Amos opens with denunciation of seven nations, foreign to Israel, because they have committed social sins. Amos begins with those nations that are furthest away, gradually naming those closer, until he has drawn a net about Israel. Then follows the injunction against Israel herself, the first and last of which is social injustices:

> Because they have sold the righteous for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes--they that pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor, and turn aside the way of the meek: . . . and they lay themselves down beside every altar upon clothes taken in pledge; and in the house of their God they drink the wine of such as have been fined.[85]

Other passages which speak against injustice are:

> Hear this word, ye kine of Bashan, that are in the mountain of Samaria, that oppress the poor, that crush the needy, that say unto the lords, Bring and let us drink . . . Ye who turn justice to wormwood, and cast down righteousness to the earth. For I know how manifold are your transgressions, and how mighty are your sins--ye that afflict the just, that turn aside the needy in the gate from their right . . . Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish justice in the gate: But let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream. Hear this, O ye that would swallow up the needy, and cause the poor of the land to fail,

> saying, when will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and dealing falsely with balances of deceit; that we may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes, and sell the refuse of the wheat?[86]

Idolatry and adultery went hand in hand during the eighth century B.C. Amos denounced them because "a man and his father go unto the same maiden";[87] open incest would soon destroy the home and society.

It was not a new thing which Paul commanded the people of Thessalonica,[88] "If any will not work, neither let him eat." Amos denounced those who refused to work for a living and in their lazy manner draped themselves on beds of ease, while others of their specie were being exploited to make this inequality possible.

Physical and military strength are seen to be sapped by immorality:

> Therefore the flight shall perish from the swift, and the strong shall not strengthen his force, neither shall the mighty deliver himself; Neither shall he stand that handleth the bow; and he that is swift of foot shall not deliver himself: neither shall he that rideth the horse deliver himself. And he that is courageous among the mighty shall flee away naked in that day, saith the Lord.[89]

The prophet traces injustice to political tyranny:

> For they know not to do right, saith the Lord, who store up violence and robbery in their palaces. Therefore thus saith the Lord God; An adversary there shall be even round about the land; And he shall bring down thy strength from thee, and thy palaces shall be spoiled.[90]

The collapse of religion seems to be predicted when Amos says, "I will also visit the altars of Bethel: and the horns of the altars shall be cut off, and fall to the ground."[91] Ultimate poverty is forecast for the unjust when Amos says, "the houses of ivory shall perish, and the great houses shall have an end."[92] Captivity seems certain when the prophet says "Gilgal shall surely go into captivity, and Bethel shall come to nought."[93] "Wailing shall be in all streets; and they shall say in all the highways, Alas! Alas! and they shall call the husbandmen to mourning, and such as are skillful of lamentation, to wailing. And in all vineyards shall be wailing."[94] Religious activity is given as a cause for exile, too. "But ye have borne the tabernacles of your Moloch and Chium your image, the star of your god, which ye made yourselves. Therefore, will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, saith the Lord."[95] Amos describes the revelry of the people "who are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph," and promises, "Therefore now shall they go captive with the first that go captive and the banqueting of them that stretched themselves (on beds of ivory) shall be removed."[96] Rich and poor shall suffer for injustice: "He will smite the great house with breaches, and the little house with clefts."[97] Other nations are seen as instruments of judgment, "Behold, I will raise up against you a nation, O house of Israel, saith the Lord, the God of hosts; and they shall afflict you from the entering in of Hemath unto the river of the wilderness."[98] Amos reaches his high point with the suggestive words:

> Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord: And they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east, they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it. In that day shall the fair virgins and young men faint for thirst.[99]

Results of punishment and the high potential of Israel after chastisement are shown in the last three verses of the book:

> Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and all the hills shall melt.
>
> And I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens and eat the fruit of them.
>
> And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God.[100]

Amos assumes his people know of whom he speaks when he says: "Jehovah will roar like a lion from Zion."[101] Who is this speaking Personality Whose name gives authority to a message of man? None other than the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, a fact which needs no proof.

Many names are used to indicate God in Amos, Hosea, and Micah; the most common being Jehovah or Jahweh.[102] Two passages will serve to show how the names for God are used interchangeably:

> The Lord Jehovah hath sworn by himself, saith Jehovah, the God of hosts: . . . Therefore thus will I do unto thee, O Israel; and because I will do this unto thee, prepare to meet thy God, O Israel. For, lo, he that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is His thought; that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth--Jehovah, the God of hosts, in His name.[103]

The prophets attribute to God the ability and disposition to converse with His creatures. They do not prove this fact; they assume it. With Amos it is a fact that God has a voice, and "will roar," and will "utter His voice."[104]

Amos presupposes for God the attribute of foreknowledge. At no place in his message does he seek to prove this assumption; he just does not expect his congregation to question its verity.[105] If the common people in his day did not believe in God's power to foretell, the prophet surely would have been challenged to verify his assumption. Since he does not do this, it follows that both congregation and preacher agreed as to God's ability and disposition to tell in advance definite events which would surely come to pass. "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets."[106]

Amos also assumes that Israel once followed Jehovah, and that she was an organized religion.[107] As has been noted, when Jeroboam I asked his constituents to stay at home and worship, it was necessary for him to supply established places of worship at Dan and Bethel to satisfy the Israelites' desire for religious ritual. This serves to prove that Israel had an organized religion long before Amos preached. The organized religion called for a priesthood set apart and peculiar, and this fact agrees with the statement of Amos: "Then Amaziah the priest of Beth-el sent to Jeroboam."[108] In fact, the priesthood had been in existence so long that, through lack of communion with God, it had degenerated to the point that the priests fed on the sins of the people. Further, there could be very little organized religion without a written law and ritual. The entire message of Amos presupposes that there is a "law of Jehovah" in existence, and that Israel has had ample opportunity to follow it. A single verse concerning Judah will illustrate this:

> Thus saith Jehovah: For three transgressions of Judah, yea for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they have rejected the law of Jehovah, and have not kept his statutes, and their lies have caused them to err, after which their fathers did walk.[109]

Thus, not only is there a "law of Jehovah" in existence at the time of Amos, but the ancestors of Israel and Judah have used the "law" and walked according to it. Now Amos calls Israel back to God, to the light that was theirs, and gives a new interpretation of Jehovah's will.

Amos declares that God is responsible for the birth and development of Israel as a nation.

> Also, I brought you up out of the land of Egypt, and led you forty years in the wilderness, to possess the land of the Amorite. And I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites. Is it not even thus, O ye children of Israel?[110]

Amos is so sure that he is speaking the truth, he leaves the proof of this up to his congregation.

Amos also presents God as the omnipotent Creator of the universe, with power over all the nations. This, of course, was not something new in the theology of Israel, though it is likely that few Hebrews realized its ultimate significance. The creation story of Genesis, no doubt, was theirs at the time Amos preached, and they surely knew of the power over Egypt which God had wielded in bringing them out of bondage. Besides the first two chapters of Amos, two other passages emphasize the universal power of God:

> Seek Him that maketh the Pleiades and Orion, and turneth the shadow of death into the morning, and maketh the day dark with the night; that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth, Jehovah is His Name; that bringeth sudden destruction upon the strong, so that destruction cometh upon the fortress.[111]

Like David before him,[112] Amos believes God is also omnipresent:

> Though they dig into Sheol, thence shall my hand take them; and though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down. And though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel, I will search and take them out.[113]

Amos further believes God to be retributive, so that the word of the Lord to Amaziah, who ordered Amos not to prophesy, is a grim warning:

> Thou sayest, Prophesy not against Israel, and drop not thy word against the house of Isaac; therefore thus saith Jehovah: Thy wife shall be a harlot in the city, and thy sons and thy daughters shall fall by the sword, and thy land shall be divided by line: and thou thyself shall die in a land that is unclean, and Israel shall surely be led away captive out of his land.[114]

Amos believes that God uses other nations besides Israel to bring about His purpose. "I will raise up a nation against you . . . O house of Israel . . . and they shall afflict you."[115] Besides being a new emphasis in theology, this must be a shock to the social elite on beds of ease at

Bethel who think God will never chastise His chosen people. Yet God must save a remnant:

> Thus saith Jehovah: As the shepherd rescueth out of the mouth of the lion two legs, or a piece of an ear, so shall the children of Israel be rescued. . . .[116]

And to Amos the major criterion by which God will select the remnant will be moral aptitude; do they "hate the evil, and love the good, and establish justice in the gate?" If so, "it may be that Jehovah, the God of hosts, will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph."[117]

There are other passages dealing with mercy: When Amos sees his people apt to starve because of iniquity, he cries, "O Lord, Jehovah, forgive, I beseech thee: how can Jacob stand? for he is so small." Then he receives the answer, "It shall not be." When Amos sees the vision of a scorched land, and heat from heaven destroying the tilled soil, he cries, "O Lord, Jehovah, cease, I beseech thee: how shall Jacob stand? for he is small." Again God says, "This also shall not be." But when the plumbline of God's righteous expectations of man is dropped from heaven and held beside Israel's social failures, mercy is overcome by justice and God says, "I will not again pass by them any more."[118]

The God of the prophets is a personality, distinct and above His creation, and through faith in Him they feel assured of a real grip on the unseen world.

> Their God was too distinctly and concretely personal to have been . . . abstractly presented. He was a tangible, objective personality standing out in sharp relief against the personalities of his worshipers.

> He stood outside of them, and communication between Him and them was correspondingly represented in a markedly anthropomorphic manner.[119]

There is not a word in the messages of Amos, Hosea, nor Micah which is uttered without the force which comes only from a personal experience with a personal God. This can be said of the messages of Saint Paul, also. Their religion causes them to worship an objective God, and the fact that they continue and do not lose heart, but that on the contrary, their faith is increased, indicates that reality verifies the truth as they see it.

The Rhetorical Analysis

The strength of the denunciation brought by Amos is felt by his audience not only because of his specific words but through the structure of his sermons, his style, and delivery, his ethos and his pathos.

The Response to the Sermons

When Amos launches into a sermon, the anxious priest tries to squelch the speaker by insisting: "Don't prophesy against Israel, don't rave about the house of Isaac."[120] But before he is silenced, Amos gets in his words of judgment, "Thy wife shall be an harlot . . . thy sons and daughters shall fall by the sword, and thy land shall be divided . . . and thou shalt die in a polluted land."[121] Some scholars think that Amos is arrested by Amaziah at this point, held for a mock trial when word comes from the king, and then is executed as a traitor, but there seems to be no basis for this view because it appears that Amos first finishes his sermon. Speaking over the protests of the priest, Amos tells of the basket of summer fruit and pictures God beside the altar, calling for its destruction. He pleads for a prophecy released from all economic or political restraints. He startles his audience by stating that Jehovah has as much interest in Damascus, Edom, or Ammon, for example, as for dear Israel, God's chosen.

Religion is so closely correlated with patriotism that to criticize or protest against either is to be branded as a heretical traitor. To his audiences Amos is an irreligious raver and traitor; whereas Amos seeks to show that faithlessness to God is the worst possible treachery.

Although Amos was not well received by his immediate audiences, the long-range results of his sermon have rated him highly. Amos communicated ideas of justice, judgment, suffering, and redemption, and these revolutionary concepts have been incorporated and amplified in Hebrew-Christian views. Some claim that the concept of a just society makes Amos the founder of the social gospel.

The Appropriateness of the Theme to the Occasion and Audience

As we have noted, the theme of Amos is appropriate to the historical occasion because he is certain that Israel is soon to be invaded. The people must be warned, and surely a few will repent and turn to God. The message is appropriate to the audience because it is their deeds of unrighteousness and injustice which Jehovah says He will punish. However, the people themselves do not consider either the presence or message of Amos appropriate. Amos has been imagined as a vagrant from the country in coarse clothes, standing by, while the upper class file into the royal court. He apparently becomes so agitated by their arrogance that he enters abruptly, and, unannounced, begins to address them. He antagonizes them further by calling the women "fat cows of Bashan" as he reminds them that a military siege would change the style, making them of equal value with a dead donkey.[122] He concludes that invading soldiers will abuse the women until they are dead. The repacious foreigners are pictured with meathooks from the shop, or spears from the fish market, dragging the naked bodies along the valley, where the men watch them tumble down onto the smoking refuse pile below. Further, the prophet's message must seem even less appropriate when he predicts that the oppressed people will not resist invasion, but that Israel will be taken over by the invader.

Amos has been accused of inappropriately using sledge hammer belows to crack thin-shelled nuts, but he knows he must be immediately persuasive. He must win each audience in one discourse; he cannot change his message for the upper class from that which he would present to the lower or middle class. He must reach at once men of all circumstances with the same speech. He cannot aim to persuade only the auditor who is most interested, if he is to succeed as a speaker.

Angry and self-righteous, the audience supports the condemnation of other nations who are hereditary enemies. Thus, Amos gains some accord before he dares to mention the failures of Israel. After he has given his indictment of the other nations, with a suddenness he cites the sins of Israel, accusing her of cruel inhumanity.[123] Here is an example of accusation which is so arranged that the unsuspecting hearers, early disarmed by his playings upon their international hatreds, sit in silence as he lays bare their own ethical failure. Now with logic and emotion he drives toward the incriminating conclusion:

> The care with which he chose his occasion and the strategy of surprise, made possible by the fact no one knew him or what he was likely to say, rendered this one of the most notable addresses in all the annals of the prophets. In skillfulness of execution and command of the audience, this was a masterpiece.[124]

The Structure of the Sermons

There seems to be logical arrangement in the book of Amos as a whole, as the outline reveals. However, the individual messages lack overall sequence. There is no definite progression of big ideas. There are many clauses which seem to have no continuity.

The speeches of Amos are based upon facts, actual or imminent in the history of Israel, and upon certain elemental moral principles. He does not rely upon miracles or supernatural signs; he does not appeal to dogma or to law; he is supported neither by religious nor by national institutions, but still he dares to proclaim his unpopular views, as he denies that God is bound to save his erring people. For Amos, history is God's discipline of men. He spells out the consequences of injustice in neighboring nations as examples. Then he uses the same formula to indict those who boast of being favored by Jehovah; he speaks as the Voice of the God of hosts when he says, "for three transgressions and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof: because . . .[125]

Examples seldom are developed by Amos. He uses well-known material in a suggestive manner, but in most instances the application must be made by the audience. Sometimes examples are parallel in structure[126] but brevity always is a chief characteristic. For instance, even his outstanding examples of the plumbline, the basket of summer fruit, the grasshoppers, and the sifted corn are given as briefly as possible. In many cases there is the statement of comparison without identifying any similarities, as in these examples: a lion's roar, as Sodom, like fire, as a mighty stream.

It is difficult to trace the sequence of ideas with any certainty because there is disagreement among scholars about the exact number, order, length, and completeness of the speeches. The transitional "then" is used twice between the eighth and ninth discourses where the encounter of Amos and Amaziah is recorded. There can be found here, also,[127] what either may be the text of a sermonette delivered to Amaziah or the summary of a longer sermon beginning, "Now therefore hear thou the word of the Lord," and which concludes with the words, "and Israel shall surely go into captivity . . ."[128] However, in spite of some transition problems, since the shortcomings of other nations are more readily seen, the message of Amos should have greater clarity for the Israelites after he begins with the indictment of their neighbors: Damascus, Syria, Gaza, Philistia, Tyre, Edom, Ammon, and Moab.

Amos seems to proceed chronologically in his speeches upon some occasions. For example, he goes from Israel's past indebtedness to their present violations of justice, then to the future with its judgment leading either to total destruction or to complete return to morality in their relationships with man and God. In some cases he follows carefully from cause to effect by the use of "therefore," while in other instances he uses "because" or "so" to trace their miseries from the effects to the antecedent causes. In all instances he maintains the causal relationship either by inference, example, or actual statement. Usually Amos presents enough specific accusations to condemn injustice, so that no one is in doubt about who is being condemned when he reaches the pronouncement of judgment.

The purpose for the prophet's use of cause and effect is to clarify his argument with Israel. He uses evidence which is direct, indirect, and negative to state the case against them. He shows how his conclusions are drawn by deduction, how the consequences he predicts are inferred by induction. He cites experience; he arranges facts to make clear the wisdom of following his advice.

He has been accused of having no concern for purposes, motive, or cause.[129] It has been said that there is no teleological element in his discourses.[130] Perhaps there is little questioning of how or why the nation has reached its present situation, but it would be difficult to deny the argument from cause to effect as Amos traces the injustices of today to the judgments which he predicts will come on the morrow. An illustration of cause and effect in the words of Amos is paraphrased below:

> You see two people walking together:
> You know they have come together for a common purpose;
> You hear a lion roaring in the forest:
> You know he has leaped upon prey.
> You hear the young lion growl:
> You know it has taken something.
> You see a bird fall upon the ground:
> You know a bait has been set for it.
> You see a trap spring up from the ground:
> You know something has been caught.
> You hear a trumpet blown in the gate:
> You know it gives alarm that an enemy is approaching.
> You learn of disaster in a city:
> You know you hold Yahweh as its cause.[131]

After Amos states the cause of punishment, he advises the people to find a satisfying life by seeking Jehovah. His prophecy is not presented in the form of a systematic treatise; whereas part of it is an expounding of simple cause and effect, other parts are in the form of a dramatic monologue.

Analysis of Style and Delivery

There is sharp contrast in what some scholars have said about the style of Amos, for opinions vary from one extreme to the other.

According to St. Jerome, the style of Amos is neither great nor sublime. He applies the words of St. Paul to describe Amos, commenting, "imperitus sermone, sed non scientia" (rude in speech, but not in knowledge).[132]

Most scholars hold the style of Amos in high regard, however:

> His style is not sublime or pitched in the highest strain of poetry, but it is notable for clearness and energy, and shows considerable literary skill both in the arrangement of rhythm and in the grouping of parallelisms."[133]

"Amos was an orator . . . his style is graceful, measured, and rhetorical. He . . . has enriched his message with varied imagery, and bucolic figures derived from nature. His vocabulary and style are conspicuously those of Oriental homeliness, and especially of the wilderness. His sentences are regular, well-balanced and flowing, even rising at times to lyrical outbursts of poetic delineation: they are characterized by even parasomasia and rhythm."[134] "Variety in presentation was a strong element in his power. Irony, sarcasm, playing on the prejudices of his audiences, the strategy of surprise, and numerous other devices were resorted to, but were never overused . . . he ought always to be remembered as a master in the art of public address."[135]

The style of Amos is summarized by The Jewish Encyclopedia as comprehensive and varied, energetic and compelling.[136]

Amos is placed in the highest ranks of speakers when it is said that: "He was one of the greatest preachers the world has ever known. In his (1) command of language, (2) forms of expression, (3) effective illustration, (4) well-chosen images, (5) in the directness of his address and, (6) in the variety of presentation, he ranks among the masters of human speech."[137]

The style of Amos reveals the four qualities which Cicero later admired: propriety, correctness, perspicuity and ornamentation.

As we have said, his message is appropriate both to the historical occasion and to the careless audience which needs to be roused to see impending doom and its causes. Could this audience in northern Israel understand Amos? Perhaps they could not wholly understand his motivation, but they surely could understand his message.

Robertson Smith testifies to the correctness and regularity of the language of Amos, defending him as a master of pure Hebrew and of elegant composition.[138] He uses correct case, tense, gender, and number.

The following four standards for analyzing perspicuity indicate that his contemporaries should fully understand the message of Amos.

1. Thorough knowledge and understanding of the ideas: What does Amos know about his thesis of justice, ethical social relationship, and ethical relationship with Jehovah? Amos first traces the behavior of Israel's neighbors as concrete examples of injustice. He outlines the unethical practices of Judah and Israel, showing that injustice is fostered by ungrateful disobedience to God, Who brought the people up from Egypt. He amplifies their disobedience on all levels of life: personal, social, national and religious; and he shows an understanding of the consequences of injustice when he traces the fate of others and states the assured results of injustice:

> Thus saith the Lord; for three transgressions of Judah and for four I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they have despised the law of the Lord and have not kept His commandments, and their lies caused them to err, . . . But I will send a fire upon Judah and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem. Thus saith the Lord; For three transgressions of Israel, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes; . . . and a man and his father will go in unto the same maid, to profane my holy name: . . . and they drink the wine of the

condemned in the house of their god.

2. Discerning vocabulary: Amos chooses words which produce a vigorous, picturesque style. The Hebrew language may be unsuitable for expressing abstract ideas, but the work of Amos and the other prophets are outstanding examples of concrete language. Despite the limitations of Hebrew language, the message of doom pronounced by Amos upon injustice finds variety of expression by the use of 48 different words or phrases which mean destruction. They are as follows:

> woe and fire upon; go into exile (7 times); break the bar; cut off the inhabitants; turn My hand against; kindle a fire; slay; groan; visit upon; smite; take with hooks; the sword; send pestilence; perish; have an end; wailing; mourning; lamentation; cast out and drowned; go into captivity; be desolate; fallen; melt; bring down thy strength; spoil; overthrow; hurl down; cast fire upon; crush; pass through the midst; day of calamity; deliver up; lay waste; and is come; darken the earth; famine; set mine eye on them for evil; destroy; evil time; great tumults; sift; faint.

Injustice is pictured by the use of the following terms chosen from many the prophet utilizes:

> threshed; anger did tear perpetually; ripped up women with child; crush the poor; cast off all pity; burned the bones of the king; despised law; lies; hate him that speaketh uprightly; tread upon the poor; cause the seat of violence to come near; turn judgment into gall; and the fruit of righteousness into hemlock; rejoice in a thing of nought; swallow up the needy.

Suffering is threatened with a variety of powerful words:

> fire; devour their palaces; die with tumult; smitten with blasting and mildew; devoured by the palmerworm; pestilence; slain with the sword; stink; overthrown; virgin is fallen; none to raise her up; devour; none to

> raise her up; devour; none to quench it; darkness; die; burn him; thy wife shall be a harlot in the city; the land shall be divided; die in a polluted land; go into captivity; songs shall be howlings; many dead bodies in every place; land shall tremble; cast out and drowned; sundown at noon; darken the earth in the clear day; famine in the land; wander from sea to sea; run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord; shall not find it; cut them in the head; take them.

The Redemption of Israel is described primarily in the final verses of the last chapter, but earlier references to this hope exist:

> the Lord shall be with you; the God of hosts will be gracious; I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob; I will sift the house of Israel; the least grain shall not fall upon the earth; bring again from captivity; raise up the fallen tabernacle; close up the breaches; rise up his ruins; build as in days of old; possess their enemies; build and inhabit waste cities; plant vineyards and drink the wine; make gardens and eat the fruit.

The indictment of Israel is spelled out in detail with these simple, concrete words. Principles, abstractions, and philosophical treatises now can be formulated as deductions from Amos, but he seeks to make his message clear by a vocabulary that clearly pictures what is, and what is to come, and enables the audience to see it. His vocabulary is selected from the common experiences of men--from work, from war, from the household, from the marketplace, from nature, from calamity, from religious practices. He uses specific words--a lion, not just a "wild beast"; a horseman or a bowman; not a "warrior"; trumpet blown, not just an "alarm"; houses of ivory, not "expensive buildings"; two legs or a piece of an ear taken from the mouth of a lion, not just "the remains."

3. Simplicity of grammar: The book of Amos may not be a complete transcription of the prophet's speaking, but it is the oldest and most complete prophetic record available for study. There are 135 sentences in its 146 verses, thus averaging almost one sentence per verse. No simple sentence exists in his sermons, but perspicuity is increased by the fact that compound and complex sentences are usually created by simple conjunctions like "and," "but," "for," "thus," "therefore," and "because."

Twenty-four of the sentences are longer than one verse, as recorded in the King James version, but several sentences which constitute only one verse have over 50 words in them, with as many as 11 verbs and five conjunctions in a single sentence.[139] Seventeen sentences each continue for two verses; six sentences constitute three verses each, and one sentence of 86 words flows on for four verses. But still there is obvious clarity in the indictment of Amos in spite of long sentences, when he says:

> Woe unto them that are at ease in Zion. . . .
> Ye that put far away the evil day,
> and cause the seat of violence to come near;
> That lie upon beds of ivory,
> and stretch themselves upon their couches,
> and eat the lambs out of the flock,
> and the calves out of the midst of the stall:
> That chant to the sound of the viol,
> and invent to themselves instruments of musick
> like David;
> That drink wine in bowls,
> and anoint themselves with the chief ointments:
> but they are not grieved for the affliction of
> Joseph.[140]

Of this passage St. Augustine has commented: ". . . With what force is that invective hurled against those who are as if asleep in their senses, that they may awaken! 'Woe to you that are wealthy in Sion. . . .' Then that he may show them ungrateful for the benefits of God, . . . he says, 'Pass ye over to Chalane, and see . . . 'The names of places ornament his eloquence like lights:. . . Then the words which join these places are most effectively varied":[141] Augustine then goes on to point out how the second through the sixth lines of the above quotation from Amos *could* have been divided into *six* parts, each beginning with "You . . .": "You that put away . . . you that cause the seat of violence . . . you that lie upon beds of ivory . . . you that stretch yourselves . . . you that eat the lambs . . ." etc. "But it is more beautiful as it stands in that two members are joined to each pronoun so that *three* sentences result, showing by the first the impending calamity, by the second the impure bed, and by the third the groaning table."[142] Augustine then goes on to say: "It is with wonderful beauty that he did not say 'for the affliction of their brother,' but rather for their brother 'Joseph,' so that any brother may be signified in the name of him whose fame is eminent among brothers . . . how beautiful it is, and how it affects those readers who understand it, it is useless to tell anyone who does not feel it himself. . . . For these words were not devised by human industry, but were poured forth from the divine mind both wisely and eloquently."[143]

Although sentence structure in the King James Version of Amos lacks simplicity, the connectives used by the prophet in his oral presentation add a cumulative force without reducing the clarity of his message. Repetition, sequence, and concrete words used in compound or complex sentences which have no intricate philosophical abstractions may be more clear than simple sentences which involve such abstruse concepts. Amos, therefore, does not depend upon simple sentences for perspicuity, but seeks to make his message understood by the use of other elucidating factors.

4. Direct discourse: Direct discourse is used by Amos to make his message clear, to identify the speaker, and to free himself from responsibility for statements attributable to Jehovah. There is use of direct discourse especially as statements are attributed to God. In addition, the prophet sometimes speaks the words of Deity without definitely stating that it is a direct quotation. Further, 22 times Amos gives the quotations of men.

There are more first person singular words than any other personal pronouns, but second person singular and third person singular are almost as numerous. While pronouns in the second person are used 117 times, surprisingly there are none in the first chapter, and their frequency increases most in the central sections of the book where accusation is strongest--Chapters 4 and 5 especially. This high frequency of personal pronouns contributes both to clearness and to force.

Thus, perspicuity is achieved in the style of Amos by tracing his concepts of justice and judgment to their conclusions. Concrete words are arranged in sequence; causes are followed by "therefore"; results are preceded by "because"; transitional words abound; cumulative parallelisms and antithetical parallelisms heighten interest and emphasis, and clarify by showing contrast; direct discourse and clear transitions bring his sentences and concepts within the grasp of all who hear him.

Amos also uses much ornamentation through examples and illustrations, poetic parallelism, antithesis, repetition, allusion, imagery, similes, metaphors, personification, and rhetorical questions, as well as progression, suspense, and climax.

Examples and illustrations are cited from history, other nations, nature, rural life and city life, to clarify or to emphasize the prophet's message. The wide scope from which examples and illustrations are drawn should assure a clear understanding by each member of his audience. Some illustrations Amos uses are especially vivid:

> two men meeting in the desert; a roaring lion; a bird in a snare; a trumpet blown; a fire, a firebrand plucked from the burning: the pestilence of Egypt; a whirlwind; a famine; faint for thirst; flee from a lion; a bear met him; a serpent bit him; as a mighty

stream; a plumbline; mourning for an only son; locusts devouring meadows.

Poetic parallelism forms the basis of sentence structure for this Hebrew prophet. For example, balance is used from the opening statement to the concluding promise:

> The Lord will roar from Zion,
> and utter His voice from Jerusalem:
> and the habitations of the shepherds shall mourn,
> and the top of Carmel shall wither.[144]

> And I will bring again from captivity my people Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof: they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them, and I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land.[145]

Antithesis creates emphasis for Amos when he balances his thought on a "but" in the middle of sentences. For example:

> Ye have planted pleasant vineyards,
> but ye shall not drink wine of them.
> Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs;
> for I will not hear the melody of thy viols;
> But let judgment run down as waters,
> and righteousness as a mighty stream.[146]

Repetition is used especially in the first two chapters as the prophet reiterates eight times his formula, "For thus saith the Lord; for three transgressions of . . . and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof: because . . . But I will send a fire on . . . which shall devour the palaces . . .[147] This aspect of the prophet's style has been described as "a wearying" style, for Amos had a love of repetition, and he never stopped until he had hammered his point home to men's minds in a way they could never forget.[148]

Repetition takes various forms however, as Amos uses internal summaries and recasts his ideas in varied phraseology without repeating entire sentences. For example, he forcefully repeats the injustices against the poor, the certainty of punishment, the gloomy prospects for "all the sinners of my people," and the ultimate provisions for those of Israel who are not utterly destroyed. He repeats his favorite phrases, giving the forcefulness of the divine personality when he uses "thus saith the Lord," or "the Lord said" 54 times.

Allusions involving historical reference include: Zion, Jerusalem, the covenant, past failures of other nations, the exodus from Egypt, 40 years in the wilderness, Jacob, Bethel, Sodom, Gomorrah, Beersheba, Joseph, earthquake, eclipse, famine, creation of the seven stars and Orion, sacrifices, offerings, David, Isaac, Dan, and Israel.

Allusions give an indirect but powerful emphasis by reminding listeners of details and circumstances surrounding the various incidents or persons recalled by the prophet. He thus implies more than he states.

Imagery, as used by Amos, can be classified as visual (21 times), auditory (17 times), gustatory (17 times), olfactory (3 times), tactual (21 times), kinaesthetic (59 times), and organic or internal (25 times). His pictorial speech may involve imagery of debatable classification, but its diversity and prevalence are unquestionable.

Visual images include:

wither, height like cedars; horns of the altar; maketh the morning darkness; maketh the seven stars; as a mighty stream; grasshoppers; the Lord stood on the wall; high places become desolate; sundown at noon; the Lord standing on the altar; buildeth his stories in heavens.

Included among the auditory images are:

roar; shouting (2); sound of trumpet; young lion cries out; calls for waters; noise of thy songs; melody of viols; songs will be howlings; songs turn to lamentation; hearing the words of the Lord.

Of the gustatory images these are a few:

destroyed fruit from above; lack of bread; not drink wine; wine in bowls; banquet; gall; hemlock; eating the grass; there eat bread; basket of summer fruit; thirst for water.

Olfactory imagery is least frequently employed. Two examples are the following:

the stink of your camps; I will not smell in your solemn assemblies.

Tactual imagery, like visual, has power of impact:

fire (8); crush the needy; take away with hooks; with fishhooks; firebrand plucked out of the burning; pours out on the face of the earth; serpent bit him; contend by fire; land tremble; baldness on every head; cut them in the head; he shall bite them; toucheth the land.

Kinaesthetic imagery is the imagery most frequently used. Some examples follow:

threshed; holdeth the sceptre; break the bar; turn mine hand; pant; destroyed roots; pressed as a cart full of sheaves; two walk together; a bird fall; virgin of Israel is fallen; none to raise her up; flee from a lion; leaned his hand on the wall; lie on beds of ivory; built it; plowman overtake the reaper; treader of grapes; plant vineyards; make gardens; bring out the bones; horses run on the rocks; plow with oxen; run to and fro; smite the lintel; as corn is sifted in a sieve.

Organic or internal imagery ranks second in usage:

mourn; ripped up; anger did tear perpetually; burned bones into lime; as a shepherd taketh out of lion's mouth; strengthened the spoiled, strong shall not strengthen his force; call to mourning; call to wailing; burneth him; horns by our own strength; die in polluted land; dead bodies in every place, rise up as a flood; cast out and drowned; turn feasts to mourning; mourning for an only son; a bitter day; faint for thirst; I will slay; slay; drowned; as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah; store up violence; palaces shall be spoiled; a bear met him.

Such graphic language stimulates the imagination, holds attention and interest, and extends the attention span. It implements the vigorous style which characterizes Amos as a speaker. Much of his imagery is universal, and therefore touches his hearers regardless of their background. Everyone has experienced these images of Amos: stars, darkness, shadow, wall, sundown, songs, tongue, fruit, break, grass, water, smell, fire, bite, touch, walk, pant, flight, bird, house, beds, mourn, die, faint, strength. Such images say more than the speaker actually states.

Similes and metaphors eliminate long expositions which can be briefly illustrated with an image.

Similes:

like the height of cedars; strong as oaks; as a cart full of sheaves; as the shepherd rescues; pestilence like Egypt; as a firebrand plucked out of the burning; like fire; as a man flees from a lion; judgment run down as waters; righteousness as a mighty stream; as a flood; (3) like David; as mourning an only son; as a bitter day; like a flood; as children of the Ethiopians; like as corn is sifted.

Metaphors:

> Carmel shall wither; they threshed Gilead; his anger did tear; the day of the whirlwind; fathers walked; poor sold for a pair of shoes; dust on the head of the poor; his roots from below; I am pressed under you; flee away naked; lion hath roared; store up violence and robbery; in a corner of a bed; I will visit the altars; crush the needy; overthrown; virgin of Israel is fallen; none to raise her up; the shadow of death; treading upon the poor; I will pass through thee; day of the Lord is darkness; seat of violence; hold thy tongue; turn judgment to gall; righteousness unto hemlock; by whom shall Jacob arise? he is small; devoured the great deep; swallow up the needy; dig into Hell; climb up to heaven; hid in the bottom of the sea; Lord toucheth the land; it shall melt; raise up his ruins; plowman shall overtake the reaper; mountains shall drop sweet wine; all the hills shall melt; I will plant them; no more pulled up.

Comparison by simile and metaphor is impressive, graphic, and varied, and elevates and dignifies his style. Amos also uses Personification, though only four times:

> Edom pursued his brother with a sword; Moab burned the bones of Edom's king; the Amorite had his fruit destroyed from above; I will visit the transgressions of Israel upon him.

Rhetorical questions are used 31 times in different chapters, as follows:

> Is it not even thus, O ye children of Israel? Can two walk together, except they be agreed? Will a lion roar in the forest, when he hath no prey? Will a young lion cry out of his den, if he have taken nothing? Can a bird fall in a snare upon the earth, when no gin is for him? Shall one take up a snare from the earth, and have taken nothing at all? Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people shall not be afraid? Shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it? The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy? To what end is it for you? Shall not the day of the Lord be darkness, and not light? even very dark, and no brightness in it? Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? be they better than these kingdoms? or their border greater?

> Is there any with thee? Shall horses run upon the rock? will one plow there with oxen? Have we not taken to us horns by our own strength? by whom shall Jacob arise? (2) Amos, what seest thou? (2) When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit? That we may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes; yea, and sell the refuse of the wheat? Shall not the land tremble for this, and everyone mourn that dwelleth therein? Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt? And the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?

Puns are among the devices Amos uses. The plummet[149] reminds the audience of future buildings Israelite craftsmen will construct, but *anakh* (plummet) suggests *anagah* (grief) to Amos. He forsees a conquering destroyer rebuilding Palestinian cities, thus bringing grief to Israel. The basket of summer fruit[150] does not remind him of fruitful prosperity. The *cayits* (summer fruit) suggests a word with similar sound, *caits* (end). The angel of death passing over Hebrew homes in Egypt is a tradition long cherished in Israel, but now he will no more pass over them.

Amos also uses *progression* in sentence structure, building up in forcefulness to a final emphatic statement. An outstanding example is found in the fourth chapter when there is a cumulative enumeration of divine judgments upon Israel, and five times Amos gives the divine charge "Yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord." After the fifth accusing "yet," he threatens: "Therefore thus will I do unto thee, O Israel: and because I will do this unto thee, prepare to meet thy God, O Israel!"[151]

Suspense is created when he condemns the sins of surrounding nations before he begins to threaten Judah or Israel. He refers to a mysterious punishment repeatedly, as an impending calamity announced only later. This suspense arouses the attention of the hearers, besides acting as a whiplash for greater emphasis when Amos finally pronounces sentence of captivity in exile.[152] Promise of restoration is reserved almost entirely for the final section.

Climax for the entire book is achieved in the concluding chapter with the assurance of survival, but there is climax within the various speeches, too. For example, at the end of his longest speech which is recorded in the first two chapters, there is a three-verse conclusion terminating with the threat that even he who "is courageous among the mighty shall flee away naked in that day, saith the Lord."[153]

The speech of Amos is multifaceted, expressing his versatility in many ways. He uses variety in his choice of words, ideas, imagery, figures of speech, emotions, force, rhythm, names, and sentence structure. For example, Amos uses seven different terms when he refers to deity by name more than 80 times. The most frequent names are "Lord" (52 times), "Lord God" (19 times), and "Lord God of hosts" (7 times). "God," "Thy God," "God of hosts," and "Lord thy God," are also used. Deity is also quoted directly and indirectly, besides being identified by character as "holy,"[154] and by activity as follows:

> He that formeth the mountains; createth the wind, declareth unto man what is His thought: that maketh the morning darkness; treadeth upon the high places of the earth: that maketh the seven stars and Orion; turneth the shadow of death into the morning: maketh the day dark with the night; calleth for waters of the sea; poureth them out upon the face of the earth; strengtheneth the spoiled against the strong; that toucheth the land and it shall melt; that buildeth His stories in the heaven; and hath founded His troop in the earth.[155]

Versatility may include diversity in the use of words, emotions, sentences, ideas, speech patterns, force, rhythm, and other speech factors. But what is the functional effectiveness of such flexibility? Versatility is impressive, and wields emphatic power. It maintains interest and creates the impression of personal depth, intellectual stature, and unspent reserves. It is the "foremost factor in holding interest."[156] It clarifies a speech while contributing to its force and listening ease. The multiple variations of Amos give his speeches dignity, emphasis, stylistic grace, and ease.

Versatility is seen in his mode of delivery, also, Amos uses verbs as a major source of power in delivery, averaging four verbs in each verse. Eleven verbs are in the first verse of Chapter 9, and 25 verbs are in the first two sentences of that chapter. In the last 15 verses of the book, Amos employs 82 verbs, an average of more than 6 verbs in each verse. Amos reports judgments that rise from considered conclusions, and his style of delivery, as he expresses God's judgment is in an elevated literary form. He understands the reactions of his listening audience, and thus he uses historical facts drawn from neighboring cultures when he prophesies the future of Judah and Israel. His delivery, though apparently given calmly, is emphatic, full of conviction, and powerful enough to overcome Amaziah, the king's chaplain, when prophet and priest meet at Bethel. Then answered Amos, and said to Amaziah (with skillful parallelism and balance):

> I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son: but I was an herdsman, and a gatherer of sycamore fruit; And the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, "Go, prophesy unto my people Israel." "Now therefore hear thou the word of the Lord: Thou sayest, Prophesy not against Israel, and drop not thy word against the house of Isaac.
>
> Therefore, thus saith the Lord:
> Thy wife shall be an harlot in the city,
> and thy sons and thy daughters shall fall by the sword,
> and thy land shall be divided by line;
> and thou shalt die in a polluted land;
> and Israel shall surely go into captivity forth of his land.[157]

The prophet's sense of immediacy increases his persuasive power, and the strategy of surprise is basic. He so effectively combines these factors that those opposing him are unable to repress him. Rather, they are powerless before him. Amos is not teaching; he is condemning and proclaiming. Therefore he does not speak in a plain style at all, but in a moderate style with its attention-sustaining rhythm and ornamentation.

Frequently, rhythm is lost in translation, but the parallelisms of Amos retain much of both their poetic rhythm and symmetry of ideas in the English translation. "In comparatively recent times a great deal of attention has been given to the study of the metrical scheme that accompanied the sense of rhythm. While there is much about Hebrew meter that is still uncertain, it is clear that the determining principle, as in English poetry, is that of accented syllables. For the most part, the number of accents in each of the two lines of a couplet is the same; but at times, especially in dirges, a line with three accents is followed by one with two."[158] For example:

Cóme to Béthel, and transgréss:
to Gílgal, and múltiply transgréssion (Amos 4:4).

The parallelism of the thought is accompanied by a balance of the rhythm: three accents in each line. Another example is found in Amos 5:2:

Fállen, no móre to ríse,
is the vírgin Ísrael:
Forsáken she líes on her lánd,
with nóne to ráise her. . . .

In each couplet, the first line with three accents is completed by a second line with two accents. The recognition of the sound-rhythm, even though all its principles are not yet fully understood, has greatly helped in distinguishing more clearly the actual spoken words of prophetic utterance."[159]

Most of the sentences of Amos are declarative, but exclamation in a grand style is used more than the four times indicated in the King James version. Many of his vehement charges can hardly be read aloud except in the grand style of exclamation, and that is the only way he could have spoken many of the declarations of the Lord God. For example:

> Thus saith the Lord:
> For three transgressions of Judah and for four
> I will not turn away the punishment thereof:
> because they have despised the law of the Lord,
> and their lies caused them to err,
> after the which their fathers have walked:
> but I will send a fire upon Judah.[160]
>
> Yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord
> (this charge being repeated five times)
> Therefore thus will I do unto thee, O Israel:
> and because I will do this unto thee,
> prepare to meet thy God, O Israel.[161]
>
> I hate, I despise your feast days;
> and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies;
> Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs;
> But let judgment run down as waters,
> and righteousness as a mighty stream.[162]

Other phrases which sound like exclamations when read are:

> The Lord will roar from Zion:
> Hear this word, ye kine of Bashan;
> Seek the Lord and ye shall live:
> Hate the evil and love the good:
> The Lion hath roared, who will not fear?
> The Lord hath spoken, who can but prophesy?[163]

In the last chapter which speaks the final prophecy of dispersion, and promises full kingdom blessing restored to the remnant of Israel, Amos rises to a grand style in his description of the Lord God of Hosts:

> It is He that buildeth His stories in the heaven,
> and hath founded His troop in the earth;
> He that calleth for the waters of the sea,
> and poureth them out upon the face of the earth:
> The LORD is His Name.[164]

As St. Augustine states: "Again, when God is praised either on His Own account, or because of His works, what an appearance of beautiful and splendid diction arises in him who praises Him as he is able, Whom no one praises adequately and Whom no one in one way or another fails to praise!"[165]

Thus Amos moves from a moderate to a grand style, showing versatility in his mode of delivery. "The grand style differs from the moderate style not so much in that it is adorned with verbal ornaments but in that it is forceful with emotions of the spirit."[166]

Analysis of Pathos and Ethos

Pathos is a leading quality that Amos uses with a people of highly emotional nature. His use of logical materials, the force of his own ethos as a speaker, and the authoritative brandishing of his status as a spokesman for Jehovah, all exert an emotional impact upon the audience.

Denunciation of evil and reward of justice necessarily have an emotional effect. Amos strives for emotional thrust by the use of historical reference; by referring to national enemies; by giving details of injustice; by reminding of new vineyards; and hewn houses and banquets of the rich; by threats against rulers; by conflict with the strong; by depicting the suffering of the unjust; and by forecasting the ultimate triumph of Israel.

Yet apart from the subject matter itself, the language used by Amos has a heightened effect. Words, figures, examples, and sometimes even the arrangement of both sentences and ideas, combine in the speeches of Amos to exert an emotional impact. Suggestive, emotion-packed language is used to move the hearers. If a suggestive manner of expression is possible, Amos seems to prefer it. The following phrases are examples of his emotion-packed language:

> crushing the needy; threshing with threshing instruments of iron; ripped up the women with child; burned the bones of the king; sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes; turn judgment to wormwood; tread upon the poor; wailing in all vineyards and streets.

The desire for security is frequently used as a motivation (54 times), ranging from an open call for self-preservation in calamitous times to the naming of tragedies befalling other erring nations. Amos emphasizes that the welfare of the individual with his family and possessions is at stake. Judgment may come upon them as natural calamity, fire, famine, pestilence, disease, military disaster, captivity, or an unidentified destruction: Impending judgment hangs over the nation.

The hope for survival demands action, but the message of doom does not outline a plan for escape, except as a call to "let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream,"[167] and to "seek the Lord, and ye shall live; Seek ye Me, and ye shall live."[168] Amos assumes that his hearers have known the way to the Rock of safety, so when he cries out against the way of the transgressors, he seldom points to the way of the righteous. Most of his message is just warnings of coming judgment. It is in the fifth chapter that he advises Israel to seek God, good, judgment, and righteousness as a security against calamities which are certain to come; but all of the remainder of the book is an unrelenting pronouncement of doom until the final five verses. It seems almost incidental that he says the only security for them is in turning to love God. As the nation understands right, he attempts to move them to action which is consistent with their knowledge, by emphasizing their present insecurity. The following is an example of his emphasis on insecurity.

> For thus saith the Lord God: The city that went out by a thousand shall leave an hundred, and that which went forth by an hundred shall leave ten, to the house of Israel. For thus saith the Lord unto the house of Israel, Seek ye me, and ye shall live: . . . Seek the Lord and ye shall live: lest He break out like fire in the house of Joseph and devour it, and there be none to quench it in Bethel. . . . Therefore now shall they go captive with the first that go captive, and the banquet of them that stretched themselves shall be removed. . . . and the high places shall be desolate, and the sanctuaries of Israel shall be laid waste; And I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword. . . . and Israel shall be led away captive out of their own land. The Lord hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, Surely I will never forget any of their works. Shall not the land tremble for this, and everyone mourn that dwelleth therein? and it shall rise up wholly as a flood; and it shall be cast out and drowned, as by the flood of Egypt. And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day.[169]

The prophet's persuasion to guilt feelings (46 times), is found in all but the last chapter. Amos is an unceasing accuser as he appeals to conscience by enumerating Israel's injustices. The people are led to admit the inequity of the behavior of others before they hear themselves charged with even greater guilt. They are accused of being ingrates who have been delivered from Egyptian slavery, but now devour their own families in a day of plenty. They are as immoral as the pagans; they are chastised fools who do not learn from experience. They are proud of their advantages but are unfaithful to the responsibilities which result from their favored position among the nations. Their covenant is broken; their heritage is dissipated. Now they are sentenced to a just reward for their unjust behavior.

> Thus saith the Lord . . . yet I destroyed the Amorite before them, whose height was the height of the cedars, and he was strong as the oaks; Yet I destroyed his fruit from above, and his roots from beneath. Also I brought you up from the land of Egypt, and led you forty years through the wilderness, and I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites. Is it not even thus, O ye children of Israel? saith the Lord. But ye gave the Nazarites wine to drink; and commanded the prophets, saying, Prophesy not. Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying, You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities.[170]

Suffering on every level is threatened by Amos 25 times. In all nine chapters he threatens repeatedly with fire, exile, wailing, darkness, pestilence, plague, death, public humiliation, grief, futile flight, and the bite of the serpent. He warns that the sword shall slay, the flood shall drown until "all the sinners of my people shall die.[171]

> The Lord God hath sworn by his holiness, that, lo, the days shall come upon you, that he will take you away with hooks, and your posterity with fishhooks. And the songs of the temple shall be howlings in that day, saith the Lord God: there shall be many dead bodies in every place; they shall cast them forth with silence. And I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation, and I will bring up sackcloth upon all loins, and baldness upon every head; and I will make it as the mourning of an only son, and the end thereof as a bitter day.[172]

Fear of failure also haunts men when Amos speaks of their houses as only heaps of rocks which they have constructed in vain. They have built to give the appearance of success, but when they see the houses of ivory perish and come to an end, they shall know they have failed. From the young vineyards shall come no fruit, no wine, no success, no pleasure, because of unjust living. The branch of Israel shall wither; they shall fall never to rise again. With all hope of succor gone, her ruin will be complete when the remnant of Jacob is led beyond Damascus into the exile of slavery. As their social life has ended in the failure of moral collapse, so shall their economic, political, and religious life terminate in complete failure. "They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, Thy God, O Dan, liveth; and, the manner of Beersheba liveth; even they shall fall, and never rise up again."[173]

In 13 verses almost evenly divided among motivations to success, satisfaction, and integrity, the prophet tries to inspire the people to realign their goals. He attempts to challenge the nation to include broader horizons than just their own physical propensities.

Amos teaches that achievement is to be found in ethical relationship with men which is coupled to a fellowship with Jehovah. If the God of hosts is with them, they cannot fail. His presence and help will be genuine instead of merely imagined as the case is now. The empty prosperity of things shall be superseded by a genuine, permanent success. They shall be established by Jehovah according to the dreams of their forefathers, to be "no more pulled up out of their land."[174]

Amos appeals to man's highest desires for physical satisfaction 4 times, in the peaceful scene etched in the final verses of his book:

> In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof: and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old: That they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen, which are called by my name, saith the Lord that doeth this. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and all the hills shall melt. . . . and I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them.[175]

The call to personal integrity is diffused throughout the book of Amos as he appeals to the conscience of people who have known the way of justice. No doubt some of them are moved with emotional desire to obey when he calls "But let judgment run down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream."[176]

The ethos of Amos might overwhelm some of his uncertain listeners, as he confidently claims that both he and God know the future. Amos speaks for God in the first person, claiming that as a prophet he is bringing the divine message. Perhaps Amos brings the pressure of authority upon his audience most of all by his testimony that God has come into his life with the imperative, "Go, prophesy!" A strong ethos mingles with his appeals to logic and authority. For example, recognition of Amos as a prophet is no doubt supported in the people's minds by his confronting the rich overlords with the message of justice to be applied in every area of human relationship. The audience can logically infer that God would entrust such a message only with a moral man, so Amos must have good moral character in order to bring the message he speaks.

Amos shows his intelligence as a speaker wherever it will impress the audience. He doesn't boast, but he presents his information judiciously while making it serve to illustrate his message. He knows of the inundations of the Nile,[177] the Philistine slave traders,[178] frequent outbreaks of plague in Egypt,[179] and the history of surrounding peoples.[180] Obviously the journey he made into the Northern Kingdom to exercise his ministry as a prophet was not the beginning of his travels, for his utterances reveal a familiarity both with conditions in Israel and with the general situation in neighboring countries.[181] He shows an intelligent grasp of the facts with a confident air of experience as he displays an impressive array of information in his sweeping denunciations of injustice at home and abroad.

The message of Amos is too grave to demonstrate *goodwill* by a host of flowery promises or by humor. But he proves his concern for the people by becoming the champion of the oppressed poor, instead of being frightened into silence when he sees the widespread inequities. He can gain no personal advantage by opposing the powerful rich, but he risks his life when he speaks out against their injustices. He supports an unpopular cause as a stranger in the midst of oppression. He has developed a grim objectivity with a severe sense of Justice. "From the fierceness of his words we may sometimes feel that Amos had a certain delight in being the bearer of doom, and that there is an element of vindictiveness, or, at least, of heartlessness, in his proclamation, especially in the careful closing of every way of escape. But this we have no right to infer."[182]

Not that Amos was devoid of human sympathy. In the first two visions the prayer that God would forgive Israel came instinctively to his lips (Amos 7:1-6). The refrain with which he represents God as pleading with his people through the disasters that had befallen them speaks eloquently of his understanding of God's concern for that people. "The austere severity of his utterance and the bitterness of its irony are indicative of one who had cared deeply and had had to overcome a natural reluctance to deliver his message. Only the overwhelming sense of the majesty and splendor of the righteousness of God--a righteousness which must have free course in his world--could sustain the prophet in his harsh and forbidding ministry."[183]

The expression of his sense of justice is not tempered by his love. This makes him a better witness if not a better prophet. He sees God with a stern, uncompromising temperament. There is no hint of family ties to mellow his own severe sense of right, but he sits as a judge who is scarcely moved by the sentence of doom he pronounces.

Few persons have spoken with more daring than Amos. However, his boldness seems not to be born of enthusiasm, but rather of a near-fatalistic view. He speaks as the Voice of God. Thus, he is more than a rabble-rouser using a wild, harsh voice to intimidate his hearers. He claims to be under divine orders, and so speaks as one sent. In his mind, the spiritual character of God is wholly inconsistent with the routines of popular religion, for he sees God as pleased by personal character rather than by elaborate ceremony with its costly sacrifices.

His hearers must recognize Amos as a man of forceful purpose. He has not come to Bethel for money, or glory, or recognition, or fame, but because he could not help coming. Therefore, they who are "worshipping" on beds of ease hear such startling assertions as these: "Hear this word, ye kine of Bashan . . . the Lord Jehovah has sworn by His holiness . . . therefore thus will I do to thee, O Israel; and because I will do this unto thee, prepare to meet thy God, O Israel."[184]

It would be impossible to explain the activity of Amos, Hosea, and Micah without positing for them a personal experience with God. Moses hesitated to return to Egypt and the Elders of Israel because he realized his own limitations. But when he was assured of God's presence and promised that Presence would go with him to Egypt, Moses was ready. The preaching and willing martyrdom of the Apostle Paul could not be explained without the resurrection and continued presence of Christ. The message of Amos, Hosea, and Micah can not be rationalized by referring to their natural heritage. They were not merely the products of their day. As T. G. Soares has pointed out, the prophet "was a man who had an experience of God. To him the most evidently certain fact of life was God. Explain it as we may, the prophet lived with a most intimate sense of community with God."[185] Amos continually listened for God's voice, saying, "Surely the Lord Jehovah will do nothing except He reveal His secrets unto His servants, the prophets." When God did communicate, there was nothing to do but preach, or, as Amos put it: "The lion hath roared; who will not fear? The Lord Jehovah hath spoken; who can but prophesy?"[186]

Summary

Scholars conclude that the ministry of Amos begins about 760 B.D., or 400 years before the Greek rhetorical theories were codified in Aristotle's Rhetoric. Amos comes from the wilderness of Tekoa, south of Jerusalem. His work as a herdsman and orchardman is interrupted when God commands him to "Go, prophesy!" The words of Amos reveal familiarity with nations, their origins, their cultures, geography, character, and morals. Some scholars insist that Amos is an unlettered rustic, while other Hebrew scholars insist that there is no stronger or purer literary style in the entire Old Testament.

As in the case of the Apostle Paul, we may have abstracts or summaries of the prophet's speeches, rather than complete transcriptions. However, whereas most of Paul's speeches have definite systematic structure, Amos lacks overall sequence in his addresses; there is no definite progression of big ideas. There is an abundance of short clauses without continuity or flow. Amos reasons from cause to effect. Throughout the book, the logic of causal relationship either is inferred, stated, or illustrated by example. He preaches against social injustice, immorality, and faithlessness to Jehovah.

Amos uses the strategy of surprise to declare his accusations and judgments. He gains some accord from his audience by indicting other nations, enemies of Israel, then cites the sins of Israel and drives toward the incriminating conclusion. He tries to reach at once, men of all circumstances, without adapting his speech.

The four elements of style: propriety, correctness, perspicuity, and ornamentation can be found in the speeches of Amos.

The message of Amos is appropriate to the lives of the audience and the occasion of impending doom. The prophet clearly traces social injustice to its consequences in the life of the individual, the family, and the nation. He amplifies with ornamentation, using not only examples and illustrations, but also poetic parallelism, or balance, antithesis, repetition, allusion, imagery, similes, metaphors, personification, rhetorical questions, and rhythm, as well as progression, suspense, and climax. A leading factor is his abundant use of imagery and rhythm. He speaks in buccolic figures of the wilderness.

The prophet exemplifies versatility through diversity of words, ideas, emotions, speech patterns, and rhythm, and through his changing modes of delivery from a moderate to an ardent grand style.

The motivations used by Amos are predominantly emotional. The negative elements of pathos are most characteristic, and he employs pathos in this order of frequency: a sense of insecurity, feelings of guilt, fear of suffering, and fear of failure. Amos also attempts to gain response by arousing the people to desire success, integrity, and satisfaction.

Though Amos identifies with his audience in intercession for them, the mark of a true prophet, he also conveys the pleadings, indignation, and wrath of Jehovah, speaking in the character of God, in the first person, with authority. He does not deliberately convey his own ethos, but the audience can logically infer from the message that Amos is intelligent, courageous, and of good moral character. His listeners should also be able to infer his goodwill, but most of them do not.

The immediate results of the message are dismal. The priest of Bethel tries to silence Amos, and to most of his audience the prophet is a raver and a traitor. God's judgment falls, and all but a remnant of repentant ones are slain. However, the revolutionary concepts of Amos concerning justice, judgment, suffering, and redemption have been incorporated and amplified in Hebrew-Christian views. Some claim that the concept of a just society, which this "prophet of doom" preaches, makes him the founder of the social gospel.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Hebrews 1:1, 2a.

[2] Galatians 4:4.

[3] Jewish commentators suggest that his name indicates one who sutters or is slow of speech. If that is true, Amos is in company with Demosthenes, and Moses, who insisted that he was a man of slow speech, and also with Paul in the New Testament who states that his antagonists have accused him of contemptible speech.

[4] Acts 26:26b.

[5] G. L. Robinson, The Twelve Minor Prophets (New York: Harper & Bros., 1926), p. 50.

[6] Walter G. Williams, The Prophets: Pioneers to Christianity (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), p. 152.

[7] Amos 5:25.

[8] Amos 9:2-8.

[9] Amos 4:13; 5:8.

[10] W. R. Smith, The Prophets of Israel (2nd ed.; London: A. C. Black, 1897), p. 126.

[11] Amos 1:1.

[12] II Chron. 26:16-20. Cf. also Alfred Edersheim, The History of Israel and Judah, vol. 7, p. 61.

[13] One theory holds that Amos journeys to the headquarters of the northern king, accompanied by a chorus, to present in strophe and anti-strophe the sermon which is found in the first two chapters of his book. While the whole could be effectively given in such choral arrangement, it does not seem likely that Amos, with his rural background, would go to this extent in preparing the setting for his first public utterance. See William R. Harper, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea"; The Interna-

tional Critical Commentary, ed. by S. R. Driver, et al. (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. 9.

[14] William B. Bizzell, The Social Teachings of the Jewish Prophets (Boston: Sherman & French, 1916), p. 61.

[15] H. E. W. Fosbroke, "Amos Introduction," The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), VI:766.

[16] Flavius Josephus in his Antiquities of the Jews, Book IX; Chapter X says the earthquake was coincident with Uzziah's leprosy.

[17] Amos 1:3, 13; 4:6-11.

[18] II Kings 14:25-26.

[19] Amos 6:14.

[20] Rev. F. W. Farrar, The Minor Prophets (New York: Anson D. R. Randolph & Co., n.d.), p. 38.

[21] Farrar, The Minor Prophets, p. 39.

[22] Albert Edward Bailey & Charles Foster Kent, History of the Hebrew Commonwealth (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1934), p. 184.

[23] Amos 2:6.

[24] Charles F. Kent, The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1932), pp. 39-40.

[25] Amos 2:6c-7; 3:10, 6:3-6.

[26] Amos 5:7, 10, 12.

[27] Amos 4:4.

[28] Genesis 20:7b.

[29] Deuteronomy 18:15-22.

[30] Amos 7:10-17.

[31] II Kings 14:24.

[32] Herbert L. Willett, The Prophets of Israel (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1899), p. 45.

[33] Amos 2:8.

[34] Bailey & Foster, *History of Israel* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 187-188.

[35] Amos 4:4, 5; 8:4ff.

[36] Genesis 12:8.

[37] Genesis 28:19.

[38] Nearly 150 years before Amos, another prophet out of Judah came to prophesy against the altar at Bethel. He spoke against Samaria, against the king, and against the priests of Bethel (I Kings 13). The former unnamed prophet was deceived by the Bethel Seer; he turned aside to eat with this older prophet, and was killed by a lion.

[39] Rolland E. Wolfe, *Meet Amos and Hosea* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1945), pp. 66, 67.

[40] Amos 7:14, 15.

[41] Amos 3:8.

[42] Amos 7:14.

[43] Samuel, the leader of the prophets, instructed Saul to go to the hill of God saying: "Thou shalt meet a band of prophets coming down from a high place with a psaltery, and a timbrel, and pipe, and a harp, before them; and they will be prophesying, and the Spirit of Jehovah will come mightily upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man." It happened as Samuel had said, insomuch that the people queried, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" (I Samuel 10:5, 6, 11) During a great famine of the ninth century B.C., Obadiah, who was over the household of Ahab, took 100 prophets of Jehovah and hid them in two caves. Then he sent bread and water to them regularly that they might not perish. Such action as this was necessitated because Jezebel had cut off their rations (I Kings 18:3, 4, 13). This is incidental testimony to the fact that prophetic bands received daily sustenance because of their profession.

[44] Amos 7:12, 13.

[45] Amos 7:14, 15.

[46] Amos 8:1-14.

[47] Amos 5:21-24.

[48] Amos 4:2.

[49] Beryl D. Cohen, The Prophets: Their Personalities and Teachings (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1939), pp. 35, 36.

[50] Amos 5:14, 15, 24.

[51] Amos 4:6-11.

[52] Ferdinand Isserman, Moses and the Prophets (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1933), p. 157.

[53] Ferdinand Isserman, p. 41.

[54] Amos 4:4, 5.

[55] Amos 5:4-6.

[56] Amos 2:4, 5.

[57] Amos 2:6.

[58] Amos 3:1-15.

[59] Amos 4:1-3.

[60] In The Speaker's Bible, James Hastings combines these three verses with the preceding chapter to form the second discourse, thus reducing the total number of discourses to nine instead of ten.

[61] Amos 4:12.

[62] Amos 5:1-17.

[63] Amos 5:18-27.

[64] Amos 6:1-14.

[65] Amos 7:1-9.

[66] Amos 7:10-17.

[67] Amos 8:1-14.

[68] Amos 9.

[69] Amos 9:8b.

[70] G. A. Smith, Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament (New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1901), p. 61.

[71] Raymond Calkins, *The Modern Message of the Minor Prophets* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1947), p. 19.

[72] G. A. Smith, p. 45.

[73] Amos 2:6; 8:4-7.

[74] Amos 2:8.

[75] Amos 5:5.

[76] Amos 5:11, 12; 4:1.

[77] Amos 3:15; 5:11; 6:4-6.

[78] Amos 7:10-17.

[79] Amos 5:12.

[80] Amos 4:4ff.; 5:5ff.; 6:3; 8:14.

[81] Amos 4:2.

[82] Amos 2:11; Jer. 35.

[83] Amos 9:8-10.

[84] Amos 5:18; 6:9-11.

[85] Amos 2:6b, 7a, 8.

[86] Amos 4:1; 5:7, 12, 15a, 24; 8:4-6.

[87] Amos 2:7b

[88] II Thessalonians 3:10b.

[89] Amos 2:14-16.

[90] Amos 3:11, 12.

[91] Amos 3:14.

[92] Amos 3:15.

[93] Amos 5:5.

[94] Amos 5:16, 17.

[95] Amos 5:26, 27.

[96] Amos 6:7.

[97] Amos 6:11.

[98] Amos 6:14.

[99] Amos 8:11-13.

[100] Amos 9:13-15.

[101] Amos 1:2a.

[102] Yahweh is used in different ways 52 times in Amos alone, and about as many times in Hosea. The word for God (Elohim) occurs alone but once in Amos as a proper noun (4:11), but in Hosea and Micah it is often found. The word for Lord (Adhonay) is found alone only three times in Amos, and not at all in Hosea. It occurs 19 times in Amos connected to Yahweh. Yahweh Elohim of hosts is used in Amos six times. Others are Adhonay Yahweh of hosts, Adhonay Yahweh, Elohim of hosts, and even Yahweh, Elohim of hosts, the Adhonay. "Such titles are calculated to add solemnity to a passage." H. G. Mitchell, Amos: An Essay in Exegesis, p. 187.

[103] Amos 6:8a; 4:12, 13. Underlining mine.

[104] Amos 1:2.

[105] Amos 6:7; 7:9; 9:8-10, 11-15. Also, see Hosea 6:11; 7:16; 8:13, 14; 9:3, 4; 10:6; 11:5.

[106] Amos 3:7.

[107] If Israel did not have an organized religion and priesthood, she was 1,000 years behind the other nations of her day. This, if it were the truth, would do violence to the critical theory that Israel had a natural genius for religion, and also that religion develops in a straight line upward. Cf., The Monuments and the Old Testament, by Ira M. Price, p. 226; and Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt, by Breasted, p. 81.

[108] Amos 7:10a.

[109] Amos 2:4.

[110] Amos 2:10, 11.

[111] Amos 5:8, 9.

[112] Psalms 139.

[113] Amos 9:2-4.

[114] Amos 7:16, 17.

[115] Amos 6:14.

[116] Amos 3:12.

[117] Amos 5:15.

[118] Amos 7:1-8.

[119] J. M. Powis Smith, The Prophet and His Problems (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1914), p. 210.

[120] Amos 7:16.

[121] Amos 7:17.

[122] Amos 4:2-3.

[123] Amos 2:6-16.

[124] R. E. Wolfe, Men of Prophetic Fire (Boston: Beacon, 1951), p. 40.

[125] Amos 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 13; 2:1, 4, 6.

[126] Amos 5:19.

[127] Amos 8:10-17.

[128] Amos 7:16-17.

[129] William R. Harper, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea," The International Critical Commentary, ed. S. R. Driver, et al. (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. cxxx.

[130] Harper, p. cxxx.

[131] Amos 3:3-7, as paraphrased by Elmer A. Leslie, The Prophets Tell Their Own Story (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1939), p. 23.

[132] Fosbroke, "Amos Introduction," The Interpreter's Bible, pp. 771, 772.

[133] "Introduction to the Book of Amos," The Pulpit Commentary, ed. Spence & Exell (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., n.d.), p. v.

[134] George L. Robinson, The Twelve Minor Prophets (New York: Harper & Bros., 1926), pp. 50, 51.

[135] Rolland E. Wolfe, Meet Amos and Hosea (New York: Harper & Bros., 1945), pp. 62, 63.

[136] The Jewish Encyclopedia (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905), pp. x, 214.

[137] Raymond Calkins, The Modern Message of the Minor Prophets (New York: Harper & Bros., 1947), pp. 22, 23.

[138] Robertson Smith, cited by F. Davidson, The New Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), p. 700.

[139] Amos 9:1.

[140] Amos 6:3-6.

[141] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1958), Book IV, VII, 129-132.

[142] Saint Augustine, Book IV, VII, 131.

[143] Saint Augustine, Book IV, VII, 131, 132.

[144] Amos 1:2.

[145] Amos 9:14, 15.

[146] Amos 5:11, 23, 24.

[147] Amos 1:3; 2:7.

[148] W. E. Orchard, Oracles of God (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1922), p. 42.

[149] Amos 7:7, 8.

[150] Amos 8:1, 2.

[151] Amos 4:12.

[152] Theodore F. K. Laetech, The Minor Prophets: Bible Commentary (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956), p. 141.

[153] Amos 2:16.

[154] Amos 2:7.

[155] Amos 4:13; 5:8; 9:5, 6.

[156] Wayne N. Thompson and Seth A. Fessenden, Basic Experiences in Speech (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1958), p. 330.

[157] Amos 7:14-17.

[158] Fosbroke, "Amos Introduction," The Interpreter's Bible, pp. 771, 772.

[159] Fosbroke, p. 172.

[160] Amos 2:4, 5.

[161] Amos 4:11, 12.

[162] Amos 5:21, 24.

[163] Amos 1:3; 4:1; 5:6, 14, 15; 3:8.

[164] Amos 9:6.

[165] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, Book IV, XIX, 146.

[166] Saint Augustine, Book IV, XIX, 146.

[167] Amos 5:4, 6.

[168] Amos 5:3, 4, 6; 6:7; 7:9, 11; 8:7, 9.

[169] Amos 2:9-12; 3:1, 2.

[170] Amos 9:10.

[171] Amos 4:2; 8:3-10.

[172] Amos 8:14.

[173] Amos 9:15.

[174] Amos 9:11-14.

[175] Amos 5:24.

[176] Amos 8:8.

[177] Amos 1:6.

[178] Amos 4:10.

[179] Amos 1:2.

[181] H. E. W. Fosbroke, "Amos Introduction," The Interpreter's Bible, p. 764.

[182] W. E. Orchard, Oracles of God, p. 51.

[183] H. E. W. Fosbroke, "Amos Introduction," The Interpreter's Bible, p. 770.

[184] Amos 4:1, 2, 12.

[185] Theodore Gerald Soares, The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1932), p. 21.

[186] Amos 3:7, 8.

CHAPTER V

THE RHETORIC OF SAINT PAUL IN ACTS 17

Sometime in the autumn of A.D. 53 a Jew about 50 years of age walked into the city of Athens, the center of Greek intellectual life. His name was Paul, and he was about to give an address to the Athenians on Mars Hill, preaching before the intellectualists and philosophers of the court of Areopagus. This speech is perhaps the most famous sermon in history.

T. Harwood Pattison describes the message as one of "careful preparation."[1] Rackham designates it as a "typical sermon to the Gentiles."[2] Actually it was far more: it was the "decisive moment in the encounter of Greeks and Christians. The future of Christianity as a world religion depended on it."[3]

Adequate speech criticism requires a knowledge of the historical background of the speech. A. J. Croft, in his article on "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," presents the need for such an approach:

> The main function of history and criticism is to show how propositions and audiences are connected; how a speaker uses techniques to adapt his ideas to the ideas of his audience.[4]

Main propositions of a speech must be approached in terms of the receptivity of the audience to the ideas the speaker plans to present. Those materials used in such analysis will be the popular ethical and social values involved. "The speech will assert and compare, deprecate or heighten, and finally unite these values to imply social action."[5] The proposals made in a speech become acceptable to an audience only as they are derived from the values of the audience, or as the speaker attempts to modify or redirect the listeners' values.[6] Thonssen and Baird suggest that speeches occur in social settings:

> Consequently, their interpretation and criticism must stem from a knowledge of the forces and conditions operative in the social situation at the particular time. In the broadest sense, therefore, the constituents of the rhetorical judgment are without limit as to number and scope; everything that impinges upon the environment plays a part in shaping a speech and therefore in determining the criticism of it.[7]

The necessity of studying such concepts within society, in relation to a speech, gives direction to this chapter. Thomas R. Nilsen elaborates on this necessity when he points out that the critic's "interest in man and society stems from the fact that man fulfills himself only in a social context, through his interactions, direct and indirect, with other men."[8] Society is a set of relationships among people, a pattern of interactions among men. Thus, whether Paul originally intended to preach in the society at Athens, after the tiring and dangerous experiences of the past weeks (Acts 16:11-17:15), or whether he intended simply to rest while waiting for friends to join him, the rhetorical situation there, and his own deep convictions, constrained him to speak, and the Christian message was spoken in the cradle of Greek philosophy.

The Historical Setting

When Paul first entered the city of Athens, he saw, no doubt to his sorrow and consternation, that the city was a veritable forest of idols. This is the full meaning of the Greek κατειδδ́λοs, "full of idols."[9] Wycherley points out that κατά added to a word gives the sense of overflowing. It is used, for example, in references to luxuriant vegetation, or to a "good head of hair," and in such culinary descriptions as "well-sprinkled with vinegar" or "well-covered with cheese."[10] The streets of Athens were literally filled with temples, shrines, statues, altars, monuments, pillars, pedestals, and dedications. To fully document the totality of Athenian idolatry would take many pages,[11] for the city was saturated with "statues of gods and men--statues notable for every sort of material and artistry."[12] Lucian says of the city, "On every side there are altars, victims, temples, and festivals."[13] Miller states that there was scarcely a doorway in either a public building or a private home that did not confront the visitor with an altar.[14] Petronius exclaims, "It was easier to find a god than a man there."[15] Even virtues and vices were personified and worshipped. Pausanias lists altars to Mercy, Shamefastness, Rumor, and Effort, and mentions a cult of Persuasion.[16] Cicero approved of the deification of Intellect, Piety, Virtue, and Good Faith, but complained that Athens did a "bad thing" when "they established a temple to Disgrace and Insolence; for it is proper to deify the virtues but not the vices."[17] Strabo, in his geography of the ancient world, hestitated to "describe the multitude of things in this city that are lauded and proclaimed far and wide."[18] (Athens was the great home of literature, art, and science, and had been the school mistress of Europe until the decree of Justinian in 529 ended its thousand-year career as the teacher of philosophy.) Strabo, therefore, feared that to fully describe Athens would take him on too great a digression. Instead, he contented himself with simply recalling Hegesias' summation of Athens as "the possession of the gods, who seized it as a sanctuary for themselves."[19]

The Apostle Paul's spirit was stirred at the sight of this rampant idol worship;[20] in the presence of such ignorance he could not remain silent, and following his normal procedure, he first took advantage of the openness of the synagogue to reason with the Jews and God-fearers worshipping there.[21]

> Whenever the messengers of Christianity traveled, they met with people with whom they had many religious conceptions in common. Their first sermons were delivered in synagogues, their first converts were Jews and proselytes. The synagogue was the bridge by which Christianity crossed over to the heathen.[22]

Paul also went daily into the agora to talk with those who happened to be there.[23]

The agora, or marketplace, was the commercial, political, and social center of Athenian life. According to Ricciotti, most of Athenian life was carried on in public places, and especially in the marketplace. The citizens of Athens did everything there. They bought, sold, traded, discussed politics, and prayed to their gods.

> In one corner a rhetorician harangued the crowds, while in another, a strolling player parodied the mannerisms of celebrated personages. On one side of the portico enclosing the agora the Stoics had installed themselves to study the doctrines of Zeno. Opposite them the disciples of Epicurus were elaborating the philosophy of their master. Strangers from far-off regions, dressed in the garb of pilgrims, arrived every now and then and described the powers of some unknown oriental god, the efficacy of an unknown rite, or the magic virtues of mysterious stones or plants.[24]

The Athenians crowded the agora every day and spent more time there than in their homes. "Idle, talkative, mocking, greedy for news, they were busy trying to see and hear everything that was going on."[25] They could watch jugglers, storm a merchant from India with questions, listen to a soothsayer predict the fate of the Empire or a Platonic philosopher discuss eternal ideas. The agora was one place where Paul could count on finding ready listeners.

In the course of a few days Paul probably achieved a reputation, as reports of a new teaching spread through the agora. Probably many were curious about what he had to say, and this certainly included those of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophies who encountered him.[26]

The Stoics were Pantheists. In their view God was merely the Spirit or Reason of the Universe, the Logos, divine principle and cause of the world, the essence of all that exists. Interestingly, the Gospel of John describes Christ as the Logos, the creative power of the Word through which the world was made. The Greek term logos means: (1) a thought or concept; (2) the expression or utterance of that thought. As a designation of Christ, then, Logos is very fitting because (1) In Him are embodied all the treasures of the divine wisdom, the collective "thought" of God (I Corinthians 1:24; Ephesians 3:11; Colossians 2:2, 3); and (2) He is, from eternity, but especially in His incarnation, the Utterance, Word, or Expression of the Person, Concept, and "Thought" of Deity (John 1:3-5, 9, 14-18; 14:9-11; Colossians 2:9). But while God was a directing Personality to Paul, Deity was, to the Stoic, inseparable from matter, the Reason pervading and guiding all things, apart from personality. While to Paul the world was not only Nature but a supernatural historical process which has for its stages the alienation from God and a return to Him by His direction, in the Stoic view the world was Nature remaining constantly in the same relationship to the world spirit pervading it and pervaded by it. The world was itself a rational soul, producing all things out of itself, and resuming them all to itself again. If man responded to circumstances in the most rational way, he had done his duty. To perform one's duty, his function, to act according to reason, was the important thing. The effects that followed should be considered as a matter of indifference, for outcomes could not be bad, in that all was toward the ultimate good in the rational universe. The individual was responsible, then, only for the rationality of his motives as he acted. Though what man did was in itself entirely useless, if he did not do his work he would cease to be good, for doing what part was given him in the cosmos was performing his function. True happiness, to the Stoic, was to live harmoniously with Nature, and Nature was seen to be Reason. As far as the Stoics were concerned, to the "wise man" all outward things were alike. Pleasure was no good; neither was pain or evil. Everything that conformed to Reason was good; everything contrary to Reason was evil. In this static world order, the Stoic could forget himself and his troubles, and overlook his weaknesses by looking to the perfection of the order of which he was a part.

One virtue of Stoicism was its affirmation of human equality. It ignored all political, racial, and religious boundaries, as well as social ones. All men were considered to be a part of the same divine essence; they were special vehicles of divine reason, and therefore of one blood and family. Since the "wise man" lived according to reason, he maintained perfection and self-sufficiency. He boasted of himself as being a god. Thus, Stoicism, arising from a desire to find something more satisfying to men than could be found in the earlier religions of Greece, did much to console the Greek who had lost his freedom, and much to broaden Roman justice, and to prepare the way for universalistic Christianity.

However, the Stoic doctrine had the great defect of moral unrealism. To say the world was perfect, in spite of apparent evil, suggested that the difference between good and evil was subjective and illusory, arising from man's failure to see the larger plan of nature which transmuted local evil into universal good. Stoicism had other difficulties. While the Stoics held that whatever happened was inescapably ordained, they also held that the rational soul could freely will what was ordained. Their fatalism, if not inconsistent with their doctrine of human freedom, at least took away any influence that the free willing of men might have. They said sin was not contrary to the Logos, and yet they said God punishes sin. Furthermore, their holding of the tradition of a plurality of gods while speaking of the Reason of the cosmos as one, must have been perplexing to a Christian like Paul.

By 100 B.C., Stoic teachers were denying the eternity of the world. In the first century A.D., with the exception of a few great thinkers such as Seneca, they were denying the immortality of the soul. At death it would be burned, or return to be absorbed in God. A resurrection from the dead would, then, appear to the Stoics to be irrational.

The Epicureans were virtually atheists. Their philosophy was a system of materialism in the strictest sense of the word. The world was formed by an accidental concourse of atoms and was, in no sense, created or modified by the Divinity. They may have believed popularly in some gods, but these gods were really phantoms, impressions of the mind which had no reality. Since the universe was a great accident and therefore needed no creator, neither would it have a moral governor. According to the Epicureans, regarding death, both soul and body were dissolved together and dissipated into the elements. Death was a complete cessation of the existence of man. There was, therefore, no such thing as a resurrection. The Epicurean carried out the negative implication of Paul's thought concerning the resurrection: If the dead rise not, let us eat, and drink, for tomorrow we die. While Epicurus, the Founder, taught that pleasure led to tranquility and the good life, most of his followers embraced the doctrine of voluptuousness without restraint. The typical first-century Epicurean's highest aim was to gratify himself, and to enjoy life to the fullest. The thought of duty found no place in the system. Since man had no feeling or sensation after death, he was freed from the fear of punishments in any other world than the present one. The system offered no explanation for the effort of the living organism to preserve its existence or its health.

Such were the two schools of philosophical thought in Athens, with which Paul was brought into direct contact. The Epicureans and Stoics were the most influential schools of that time. Other schools not mentioned by Luke were either compromise positions (the Academics, the Peripatetics) or were more given to practical rather than theoretical discussions (the Cynics). The Epicureans and Stoics both had teaching centers in or near the agora.[27]

Initial reaction toward the Apostle seems not to have been entirely favorable. The Athenians evidently took him to be "one of the numerous wandering orators who then went up and down the world in the service of some philosophical cause."[28] There were a host of "rhetoricians and sophists who roamed from city to city like literary knight-errants, ready to engage in any rhetorical tournament with the champions they chanced to meet. . . . There can be little doubt that Paul was taken by the frequenters of the marketplace for one of these vagrant teachers."[29]

Some dismissed Paul with a sneer: "What will this babbler say?"[30] Their word for "babbler" was an abusive piece of Athenian slang. Originally a σπερμολόγος was a small bird, such as a crow or a magpie, which picked up scattered kernels of grain. Later it was used to refer to anyone who picked up scraps in the marketplace, to a worthless character who made his living by "scrounging." Finally it came to be used figuratively to mean "a gatherer of words"--one who picked up scraps of learning here and there and purveyed them where he could.[31] "Smatterer" is a good rendering. "Unskillful plagiarist" also carries the idea.[32] It was a taunt which suggested that Paul had picked up a smattering of philosophic phraseology and was trying to pass himself off as some great teacher.

Others were more charitable toward Paul, though none-the-less confused. To them Paul seemed "to be a setter-forth of strange gods; because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection."[33] Hearing him speak of a masculine "Jesus" and a feminine "Anastasia," they thought he was introducing a new pair of deities similar to the many other divine couples that inhabited their Pantheon, with Resurrection as either the wife or daughter of Jesus. (Later on, Mohammed fell into a similar misunderstanding when he heard Christian preachers teach the Divine Trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In Arabic, the word "spirit"--ruh--is feminine, and Mohammed thought it designated a woman, the wife of the Father, and mother of the Son, Whom he then identified with the Virgin Mary.)[34]

Regardless of the Athenians' attitudes toward Paul--whether contemptuous or confused--they were all curious as to what he was saying, and interested in hearing more. But the agora, with its noise and bustle, probable was a poor place to listen or contemplate a new religious teaching. The Athenians took Paul to the seclusion of the nearby Areopagus, or Mars Hill.[35] The Areopagus was a hill situated next to the agora. Pausanias traces the name "Areopagus" or "Hill of Ares" to the legend that the first case tried on the hill was a charge of murder against Ares, the Greek god of war.[36] The translation "Mars Hill" seems justified since Mars is the Roman name for Ares. The Areopagus was the court reputed to be the most fair in the world, though it is not generally felt that Paul was brought here for trial. Here the most severe court of judicature had sat from time immemorial. Here sentence was passed on infamous criminals, and the most solemn question regarding religion would get a full hearing. Here Socrates was tried and gained immortality.[37] The judges sat in the open air upon seats hewn out of rock, from a platform which was ascended by a flight of 16 stone steps, immediately from the valley of the agora. This court was regarded with superstitious reverence; it was a place of silent awe in the midst of gaiety. No place in Athens was more suitable for a discourse upon the mysteries of religion than the Areopagus.[38] There, free from the threat of disturbances and interruptions, the Athenians asked Paul to discuss his views at greater length, saying:

> May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears; we would know therefore what these things mean.[39]

Luke, at this point, adds an explanatory remark to characterize the audience that was forming around Paul:

> For all the Athenians and strangers which were there spent their time in nothing else but either to tell, or to hear some new thing.[40]

It was an audience enamored with novelty, and endlessly inquisitive. The Athenians were noted for their curiosity. Writing four and a half centuries before Luke, Thucydides characterized the Athenians as "men who sit as spectators at exhibitions of sophists," as "spectators of words and hearers of deeds," attentive to "novel proposals," and "in thrall to the pleasures of the ear."[41] Half a century later Demosthenes complained on more than one occasion about the reckless curiosity of his fellow-citizens.[42] Novelty was apparently their life's pursuit, and Paul was saying something new. Dodd states that Paul ". . . had the orator's sense of power and delight in swaying an audience, 'demolishing arguments, and all annoyance that affronts the knowledge of God.'"[43] The Apostle willingly would satisfy the Athenian curiosity.

In summary, then, the setting of Paul's Athenian sermon is a city wholly given to idolatry. A mixed and inquisitive audience has been attracted by the Apostle's initial witness. Some of Paul's listeners are philosophers; some are not. At least one is a judge.[44] Some think he has only bits and pieces of other men's wisdom to offer. Others are confused as to who and what he is preaching. All seem to be intellectually curious and ready to listen.[45] This is an assembly, rather than a crowd, for it is a group of people in which thought, rather than feelings, is the common bond.[46]

The Biblical Exposition

The Text of the Sermon

Paul, facing his expectant audience, presents the following systematically reasoned speech:

> Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.
>
> God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands;
>
> Neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things;
>
> And hath made of one (blood) all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation:
>
> That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us:
>
> For in him we live and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, for we are also his offspring.
>
> Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device.
>
> And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent.
>
> Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained: whereof he hath given assurance unto

all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.[47]

The Content and Organization of the Sermon

The content and form of Paul's sermon at Athens is greatly influenced by the setting. It must be remembered that the Apostle Paul and the Gospel were preceded by three centuries of worldwide expansion of Greek civilization during the Hellenistic period, so that the world was unified and dominated by Greek civilization and the Greek language. "Without this postclassical evolution of Greek culture, the rise of a Christian world religion would have been impossible."[48] And, as Werner Jaeger points out, along with the Christianization of the Greek-speaking world, Christianity itself was Hellenized. We see this fact in Paul's diatribe at Athens. Paul uses the Greek language in addressing the Hellenized Jews and the Greeks. This use of Greek in preaching was the first stage in Christian Hellenism. In Palestine, Greek was understood and was used in trade and business, even by the less educated, to a much greater extent than scholars have often assumed, and Jews living outside Palestine in a Hellenized environment soon made Greek their language.[49]

At Athens Paul also quotes the poetry of Greek authors to give validity to his proclamations that God is great; and the Apostle uses largely Stoic arguments calculated to convince educated philosophical minds. Whereas Paul preached

Jesus in Antioch as the long-awaited Messiah of the Jewish nation, at Athens he seeks to cause his audience to accept Jesus as the teacher of the philosophers of pagan nations. What they have been blindly and unsuccessfully seeking religiously and philosophically has at last been made clear by divine revelation. The Apostle seeks to make Christianity appear to be a "continuation of the classical Greek paideia, which it would be logical for those who possessed the older one to accept. The ancient paideia is being superseded; Christ is the center of a new culture."[50] Paul recognizes that his message requires common ground, and so he chooses the Greek philosophical tradition as that basis, for it was "the most representative part of that which was alive in Greek culture at the time."[51] The various schools of Greek philosophy each recommended to "ignorant" men their philosophical knowledge as the only way to happiness. "The Christian Kerygma spoke of the ignorance of men and promised to give them a better knowledge, and like all philosophies, it referred to a master and teacher who possessed and revealed the truth."[52] Paul recognized this parallel situation between Christianity and the Greek philosophies. The condition of man in each of Paul's sermons is announced to be either that of ignorance or guilt. At Antioch the Apostle declares the Jews guilty of crucifying the true God;[53] at Athens Paul declares his audience to be ignorant of who the true God is. These are the grounds for conviction by the Holy Spirit: guilt and ignorance. (Unbelief can be included under guilt, or ignorance, and pride can be included under either.) In both cases man is pictured as in need of coming into a proper understanding of and relationship with God. God is great; man is not. Man thus needs God in order to become great. Man's responsibility is to repent, take heed, and believe. The resurrection of Jesus, which was witnessed by His disciples, and revealed beforehand by the prophets of old, is the basis for the exaltation of Christ as Lord and Judge over all, and for His having become the true Means of Salvation. Thus, Paul's diatribe, based on the inscription "TO THE UNKNOWN GOD," is a philosophical moral sermon. The defense of Christianity, the perfect philosophy, had to employ philosophical arguments throughout. (The difference between Greek philosophies and Christianity is that the latter represents "the coming of the Logos to man not only as a human effort but as proceeding from the divine initiative."[54]) It seems that for Paul, knowledge was chiefly received by divine revelation, to be propounded by knowledgeable rhetoric.

The Theme and Purpose of the Sermon.--What is Paul trying to say? What is he trying to accomplish?

Paul builds the sermon around his introductory promise to make the Unknown God known. What the Athenians worship but do not know, he will proclaim to them. The summary of his proclamation becomes his theme: The Unknown God is the one true God, the omnipotent, immanent Creator of the Universe and of men; Who created men that they might seek after and find Him. This statement is an affirmation of the true nature of God in contrast to the false impressions which have led the Athenians to idolatry.

By introducing his audience to this rightful conception of God, Paul hopes to open their eyes to the error and emptiness of their own religion. His ultimate goal is to persuade the Athenians to repent of their fallacious worship. God has been overlooking this ignorance, but now declares to men that all, everywhere, should repent. Paul's purpose, then, is to turn his hearers from idolatry to the service of the true and living God.

The Structure and Outline of the Sermon.--What organizational pattern is being used?

Paul begins with a favorable remark about Athenian interest in religious matters, and then announces that his address will be about the Unknown God to whom citizens of Athens have erected an altar, but whom they do not know. Altars were reared in Athens in a time of pestilence as far back as 600 B.C., in honor of the Unknown God which had granted its citizens deliverance.[55] Athenians were well-oriented toward Paul's subject.

The body of the sermon is in two parts, each of which presents an aspect of Paul's theme and a preview of his purpose. In the first part Paul presents God as Creator of the universe and reasons that God cannot, therefore, be confined by man-made shrines nor served by human hands. In the second part he characterizes God as the Creator of the human ra race, and deduces from this that He should not, therefore, be conceived of as an image.

The sermon concludes with an appeal for repentance and a warning of judgment to come by a man chosen of God.

In outline form, the structure could appear as follows:

Introduction

I. You are very religious.

II. I observed an altar to the Unknown God.

III. I will proclaim Him to you.

First part of theme

God is the Creator of the universe.

Arrangement and development of ideas

I. God made the world and all things in it.

II. God is not, therefore, confined in man-made shrines nor served by human hands.

Second part of theme

God is the Creator of men.

Arrangement and development of ideas

I. God created men as His offspring.

  A. He made men to seek Him.

  B. He helps men to find Him.

    1. He establishes the times and boundaries for them.

    2. He remains very near to them.

      a. Men are dependent on God.

2. Men are descendants from God.

II. God ought not, therefore, to be thought of as an image.

Conclusion

I. God now declares that men should repent of idolatry.

II. God has fixed a day of judgment and has appointed a Judge.

Arrangement and Development of Ideas with Emphasis upon Logos

What are Paul's main points, and how does the thought progress? What is the proper interpretation of the words?

Paul's speech develops as typical persuasion by argumentation, in which a speaker must determine what the special interests of his audience are, and in what ways he can connect them with his subject. He then builds his argument from the listeners' own material.

Following the usual salutation, Paul begins his sermon by centering on the religious devotion of the Athenians, declaring them to be "very religious." Older scholars usually limited the translation of Paul's adjective to "very superstitious."[57] However, more recent evidence has made it clear that the word, meaning literally "fearers of the gods," is sufficiently ambiguous and comprehensive to bear both connotations.[58] It is a vague term capable of expressing both praise and blame, depending on the attitude of the speaker and audience. Paul's use of the word allows his hearers to feel that they are being slightly commended for their religious scrupulosity, and probably they understand him to mean that. Yet he is left free to criticize their inadequacies and commend his own faith to them. It would be extremely imprudent to antagonistically charge them with superstition in the very beginning of his discourse. He states a fact, acknowledged by the best Greek writers, and he reasons from that fact. That fact is that the Athenians are the most religious people in Greece,[59] and that here in Athens, philosophy and everything relating to the worship of the gods is taught. Paul has been particularly struck by an altar inscribed "TO THE UNKNOWN GOD."[60] This altar, more than anything else, testifies to religious zeal. Its presence is evidence of the Athenian's desire to recognize all the divine powers of the universe. Lucian, in his _Philopatris_, uses this god in an oath: "I swear by the Unknown God of Athens"; and again, "We have found out the Unknown God of Athens--and worshipped him."[61] Yet the altar and its inscription also testify to a reverence that is without knowledge. The Athenians worship a deity, but admit they do not know who he is or what he is like. Since they have openly confessed their ignorance, Paul feels free to proclaim the truth to them, proposing to make the Unknown known.

This introduction to Paul's sermon serves four purposes. First of all, it clears up misunderstanding and answers the criticism of his activity in the _agora_. His introduction clarifies that he is not a proclaimer of "foreign deities," an act punishable by death, but rather a proclaimer of the "Unknown God" whom the Athenians themselves have tacitly acknowledged. He is simply trying to make known the God whom the Athenians reverence but of whom they have no knowledge. Nor is he a "babbler," an unskillful plagiarizer of other men's ideas, as some have criticized. Rather, he boldly asserts that he is qualified to provide them with true knowledge. He sounds a note of independent authority--what they do not know, he will tell them. This he does by using the deductive method of reasoning. Such a method was a good one to use, since it was the Stoic's own.

Second, Paul's introduction serves the purpose of orienting his audience toward the subject of idolatry. Though he does not yet take a judgmental stance toward this dominant characteristic of Athenian religion, his initial comments at least focus attention on it. His references to their religiousness, their objects of worship, and their unusual altar bring the subject to the forefront of their thoughts, and set the stage for his ultimate purpose.

Third, the introduction begins the motif of ignorance, a motif which is threaded throughout the whole sermon. It is this lack of knowledge about the true God which has led the Athenians to wrong conclusions about the qualities and characteristics of deity, and subsequently into idol worship. It is this same ignorance of which all men everywhere must now repent. This motif, then, is begun in the introduction, utilized throughout the body of the sermon, and made the basis for the concluding appeal.

Finally, and obviously, Paul's introduction reveals the direction his message will take. It announces that his sermon is to be about the nature and knowledge of the true God ignorantly titled "THE UNKNOWN GOD."

Once the theme is announced, Paul moves immediately into the body of the sermon with the development of his first main point--God is the Creator of the universe. God is the One Who has made the world and everything in it. He is the sovereign Lord of heaven and earth. He is the omnipotent Creator, the One responsible for the continuing existence of all things.

This concept of God as omnipotent Creator is fatal to both the temple services and sacrificial rites of Athenian idolatry. If God made the world and everything in it, He cannot be permanently attached to an earthly residence, such as an Athenian temple. Perhaps Paul made this statement with a sweep of his hand toward the Temple of Mars, the Sanctuary of the Eumenides, and the Parthenon of Minerva, which were all in plain sight of the Areopagus.[62] That the Creator is limited to the walls of a shrine made by hands is inconceivable. Rather, He dwells in the eternal temple of His Own creation. It is a vain contradiction of His true nature to suppose that He can be localized in something men have built. The Creator cannot be confined by His creation.

Moreover, as the sovereign Lord of heaven and earth, He is entirely independent of all human care and service. He does not need the sacrificial rites or the ceremonial offerings prepared by men. He is not served by human hands at all; the Creator needs nothing from His creatures. On the contrary, the creature is continually, and in the highest degree, dependent on the Creator, for it is God Who gives to all, life and breath and everything needful for existence. In these words the Epicureans would find confirmation of their view that the divine Being has no need of anything that men can give, and the Stoics of their view that He is the source of all life. Paul concludes that it is a mistake to think that the sovereign Lord of all creation can be served by men with material things in the manner exemplified by Athenian idolatry.

Paul's second main point is developed along the lines of his first one. He begins with an assertion about the nature of the true God--He is the Creator of men--and concludes with an application of this knowledge to the Athenian practice of idolatry. God made out of one man the whole human race to live over all the face of the earth. There are no "autochtons"--races sprung from their native soil.

The Athenians claimed that they were "autochtons," distinct from other races and the offspring of their own soil: "We are of a lineage so noble and so pure," was their claim, "that throughout our history we have continued in possession of the very land which gave us birth, since we are sprung from its very soil." They boasted that they were "neither of mixed origin nor invaders of a foreign territory but were on the contrary, alone among the Hellenes, sprung from the soil itself."[63]

Paul preaches that all mankind are one in origin, all created by God, and all derived from a single common ancestor. Man should not, then, seek some local guardian deity associated with his nation's mythological origins, but rather find his way back to the ultimate God Who created everyone. God's purpose in thus creating mankind was "that they might seek God." He made men in order that they might turn to Him in worship and service. Furthermore, God is so concerned that men seek and find Him that He deliberately aids them toward this end.

At this point Paul begins to discuss the two steps which God has taken to help men in their seeking and finding. The first step he mentions is the setting of times and boundaries. When God created men to live over all the face of the earth, He established "the fixed times and the boundaries of their habitation."

There is a controversy about the meaning of "times" and "boundaries." Some understand these as a reference to the temporal and spatial development of different nations. They see God's setting of the "times" as an ordaining of various historical epochs, a determining of set periods for the rise and fall of nations. Reference is usually made in this connection to Daniel 8, where periods of time are granted by God to the individual nations as they supersede one another. Similarly, "Boundaries" are interpreted as historical boundary lines between two inhabited areas. These are the divinely ordained geographical limitations of the different nations.[64] According to this view, therefore, God aids men in seeking Him by proscribing to each nation its time of endurance and its space to dwell in.[65]

Another view takes "times" and "boundaries" to mean not the times and boundaries of nations, but the times and boundaries of nature. According to this approach the "times" are the cycles of nature--days, months, seasons--the orderly and rhythmic sequence which makes it possible for men to have food.[66] Likewise, God's establishing of the "boundaries" is a reference to nature, to His shielding the habitation of men, the land, against the sea. The "boundaries" are the natural limits God put to the sea so that the chaos of the Flood would not once again overtake mankind.[67]

This second approach seems preferable for three reasons. First, it is more in harmony with Paul's earlier emphasis on the unity and common origin of all men. Second, it is consistent with his remarks to another pagan audience about how God in His goodness "did not leave himself without witness, for He did good and gave you from heaven, rains and fruitful seasons, satisfying your hearts with food and gladness" (Acts 14:17). (The seasons here are obviously cycles of nature, not historical epochs.) Finally, this approach reflects the common tendency to see God's ordering of the days, months, and seasons, and His restraint of the sea, as evidence of His concern for and goodness toward men.[68]

The regular and predictable "times" which govern man's existence were all established by God as a means of pointing men to Him. When He made these cycles as part of the creation, He intended that they be a clearly perceived witness to His eternal power and deity.[69] The mystery of the boundless sea remaining in check is to challenge men to contemplate a divine power.

But even with this help on God's part, Paul goes on to say, there is no assurance that men will find Him. On the contrary, it is very doubtful that any seeking based on the revelation of God in nature will actually result in finding God. The seeking of men is like the groping of the blind, or like the fumbling of those in the dark of night, when vision is so impaired that there is little possibility of success. Men's spiritual vision is impaired, their minds are darkened, causing them to fumble in thought and action. Paul's use of εἰ and the optative indicates that he expects a negative outcome from any seeking based on natural revelation. The construction is a fourth-class condition, expressing strong doubt that men will ever actually find God this way.[70]

The problem is not the light of God's revelation, but rather the perverted experience of men. In Romans 1:18-23, Paul declares that the knowledge of God has been clearly revealed in nature; but men, by repeatedly perverting this knowledge, have brought themselves to a state of darkened futility. Now their seeking is merely an ignorant groping which leads most often to the folly of idolatry, and the worship of the creature rather than the Creator.[71]

"And yet," Paul adds, "He is really not far from each one of us." God aids men in their seeking by staying in close proximity to them. Men may pervert the revelation of God in nature and make Him seem far away; but in reality God is very near and very perceptible. He is in such an intimate relationship with men that anyone who desires to know and worship Him can find Him.

Paul drives home these pronouncements by citing some of the Greek's own poets. By doing so, a speaker in Greek society enhanced his own character and aroused emotions.[72] James A. Winans and H. H. Hudson support Paul's use of poetic quotation, saying: "A speaker often wins more favorable attention to his argument if he supports it with the words of some great or authoritative person."[73] Paul quotes two lines of Greek poetic: "In Him we live and move and have our being," and "For we are also His offspring."[74] When the Apostle says, "as certain also of your own poets"[75] he does not mean poets born in Athens, but Grecian poets, among whom those quoted are chief. Their sentiments are also found in several other poets, being very common among the more enlightened philosophers. Thus, one interpretation for Paul's plural expression "some of your own poets" is that the quotation can be found in more than one poet. Another view is that the plural is due to literary convention: "The indefinite plural 'some' used in citing the poets is characteristic of the ancient method of quoting a single or known passage."[76]

Paul quotes the first Greek line of poetry to show that men are bound up in God, in Whom they live and move and have their being. He is the Source of the principle of Life, and He is the Source of Motion--the latter a difficult thing in nature to properly apprehend, and a strong proof of the continual presence and energy of the Deity. Without Him we not only can do nothing,[77] but are nothing. We continue to be because of His continued, present, all-pervading and supporting energy. "The Holy blessed God never does evil to any man. He only withdraws His gracious presence from him, and then he necessarily perisheth."[78] Some suppose that the three verbs--live, move, and having being--form an ascending scale: "Live"--the physical life of plants, animals, and men; "Move"--the independent movement of animals and men; and "have being"--the self-conscious intellectual and spiritual activity which men alone have. Others see the three verbs as anticlimactic--spiritual life, animal movement, and bare existence. However, the three verbs may also "be regarded as substantially equivalent, a cumulative or exhaustive expression of the one great thought, that our being and activity are wholly dependent on our intimate relation and proximity to God our Maker."[79]

The Stoics would have preferred that Paul say that God is in us rather than our being in Him. The former would have been more in keeping with their pantheism. But the Apostle then proceeds to show the error of their thinking: pantheism is only half the truth. God universally immanent in nature is not identical with nature, but a Being independent of nature and the Source of all its life.

Even more intimate is the relationship envisioned in Paul's second quotation--"For we are also His offspring." In this citation the proximity of God to men is defined not merely in terms of external nearness, but also in terms of essential oneness. God is close to men, for there is a similarity between God and men: men are made in His image. In this sense they are the offspring of God. (The word "Father" is not mentioned here. The Greek "Genos" means "race." God created man in His Own likness. The passage does not affirm anything concerning fatherhood or sonship, which are relationships based upon faith and the new birth (John 1:12, 13; Galatians 3:26; 4:1-7; and I John 5:1).[80]

Paul has now come full-circle in the development of his second main point--that God is the Creator of men. God helps men to seek and find Him through the natural revelation of orderly seasons and limited seas, and through the internal consciousness of His Own nearness. This latter truth is so plain that even the Greeks' own poets recognize it. Paul thus motivates his audience to action, for to feel a thing--to feel God--within one's own reach, is important to action.

The Apostle is now ready to apply this second main point to the Athenian practice of idolatry. The fact that God is the Creator of men should have bearing on the way in which men worship. If they, as intelligent, moral, and rational beings are God's offspring, having been made in His image, then He must also be an intelligent, moral, and rational Being, not a dumb, dead, and senseless idol. This appeal ought to have impressed the Athenians, for their learning and their intelligence were their pride. The Creator who enables men to live, move, and have their being, must Himself possess these qualities. He ought not, therefore, to be likened to a lifeless image that cannot move. Man's own self-respect should forbid him to think so. The Greeks felt that self-respect was taken away by grovelling to the Deity, and they considered Orientals, such as Paul, to so degrade themselves. Paul, on the contrary, presents the idea that idolatry brings a lack of self-respect. A simple contemplation of their own existence as men should lead them to a true perception of the living God, and to a renunciation of the dead images which their own hands have fashioned. The worship of idols, Paul insists, is simply incompatible with the true knowledge of God as the Creator of men.

In his first point the Apostle has stressed that God the Creator does not dwell in man-made temples nor is He served by human hands. In Paul's second point he has shown that God cannot be represented by an image. Together these thoughts oppose all aspects of Athenian idolatry--shrines, sacrifices, and images. At the same time these two points fulfill Paul's pledge to make the Unknown known, to tell about the God the Athenians reverence but do not know.

Throughout all of this Paul has been steadily building toward the ultimate aim of his sermon. This thrust now comes to full force in the sermon's conclusion as Paul calls on his audience to repent in view of the coming judgment:

> And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.[81]

At the start of his conclusion Paul ties together some of his previous thoughts. He reaffirms that the religious devotion of the Athenians is essentially being carried out in ignorance. They, themselves, acknowledge this in their altar to the Unknown God. The abundance of their temples, sacrifices, and images is further evidence that they do not know the true God. Such ignorance, Paul now declares, is inexcusable, for the knowledge of God has been readily available. It is their fault that they have not found Him, for God has revealed Himself to them through nature and through their own inner consciousness.

And yet, culpable as their ignorance is, God has mercifully overlooked it. He has allowed it to pass as if unnoticed, postponing His judgment. Paul's similar statement to another pagan audience at Lystra can be found in Acts 14:16: "Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways." The same thought--God's divine forbearance in passing over former sins--also occurs in Paul's letter to the Romans.[82]

The time of God's forbearance, however, is drawing to a close, and God is now commanding that all men everywhere repent. Messengers are being sent to the ends of the earth to announce that the divine overlooking is to stop. The accountability that has always been due will soon be demanded, for the God Who is the Creator is about to become the Judge. A day of judgment has been fixed, and a Man has been appointed who will serve as God's judicial Representative. This Man is a Man of God's Own choosing, and He will judge the world righteously and fairly. The manhood of

Christ in connection with His judging is emphasized in the Scripture. Because He is the Son of Man, He is, therefore, capable of feeling our infirmities; because He is the Son of Man, He "learned obedience" and has known temptation in all points like unto men, yet without sin. Therefore, He has been declared "worthy," and has been raised from the dead and has been appointed to judgment.[83]

The certainty of this judgment to come, Paul states, and the authentication of this divinely appointed Representative, are evidenced by the fact that God has raised Him from the dead. This resurrection, considered in itself alone, would not furnish proof that Jesus will be universal Judge; but Paul felt it did when considered in connection with the affirmation of Jesus before His death, that all judgment had been given into His hands.[84] The resurrection is evidence of the divine approval of Christ and of His words. All men will be held accountable for their worship of God. The Athenians, therefore, Paul believes, should turn from their ignorant idolatry, and should serve the true and living God Who has now been declared to them. Schweitzer says Paul's eschatology lets the natural world dissolve into the supernatural, and sees this event as having its beginning in the dying and rising again of Jesus, the exalted Lord and Judge.[85]

The Rhetorical Analysis

The Response to the Sermon

Milman states that Paul "expands the popular religion into a higher philosophy; he imbues philosophy with a profound sentiment of religion"; thus, the speech at Athens is "perhaps the most extensively and permanently effective oration ever uttered by man."[86] Stonehouse states that actually the secret of the success Paul had at Athens may be found in the Apostle's own recipe, "I have become everything to everybody, so as by all means to save some of them."[87]

The Response of the Athenians.--The audience's response to Paul's sermon was varied. Some of the Athenians mocked, others deferred, but some accepted and believed.[88]

Some of the listeners mocked when they heard of the resurrection of the dead. While they might have assented to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the concept of a resurrected physical body was to them absurd, and even repugnant. They endorsed, rather, the sentiment which Aeschylus their poet had put into the mouth of the god Apollo: "When the dust hath drained the blood of man, once he is slain, there is no return to life."[89] Though these listeners may have agreed that the worship of idols was foolishness, the concept of a bodily resurrection was beyond serious consideration. The contempt of the Greeks for the Christian idea of a bodily resurrection is reflected by Lucian:

> Indeed, people came even from the cities of Asia (to see Peregrinus in prison), sent by the Christians at their common expense, to succor and defend and encourage the hero. They show incredible speed whenever any such public action is taken; for in no time they lavish their all. So it was then in the case of Peregrinus; much money came to him from them by reason of his imprisonment, and he procured not a little revenue from it. The poor wretches have convinced themselves, first and foremost, that they are going to be immortal and live for all time, in consequence of which they despise death and even willingly give themselves into custody, most of them.[90]

Eutychus (Edmund P. Clowney), in "Jesus and Anastasia," has described the mocking refusal of Paul's message in verse form.

A learned Areopagite
Who held a Ph.D.,
Awarded him kat' exochen
By the Academy,

Was pleased to spare a moment when
The preacher had been heard
To take aside the little Jew
And offer him a word:

"You're right, of course, about the gods;
Homeric fable can't
Be credible here on the Hill
We willingly will grant.

"We much admired your reasoning
Well seasoned with quotation;
With training in philosophy
You'd gain a reputation.

"It was the more unfortunate
You closed with such a blunder;
Your resurrection concept is
As crass as Zeus' thunder!

"I do not mean you should refrain
From preaching Anastasia;
The Hellenist finds deeper truth
In all the gods of Asia,

"And Resurrection as a myth
Is one with Plato's Real;
The legend of an empty tomb
Has popular appeal.

"You need not change your discourse much,
If only it is clear
That Jesus' body is quite dead,
For myths can't happen here!"[91]

Others in Paul's audience continued to show the curiosity and interest which had led to Paul's being taken to the Areopagus in the first place. They were impressed with what he was saying, but deferred any further discussion for later, promising to hear Paul again at another time. It has been said that their proposal to hear Paul again was a polite refusal, "as a way out of an embarrassing situation, rather than as a serious promise."[92] However, it is not difficult to take their words at face value since there are other indications in the text that the Athenian sense of courtesy and politeness was not unduly developed. Paul had planted the seed for thought. Belief by argumentation more often comes later, while persuasion by appeal to emotions may show more immediate enthusiastic response, yet if not built up often will die out more readily. That some would even be willing to give Paul a second hearing when, under other circumstances, they could have called for his death, is a sign that some were willing to possibly concede that his message might be true. To this group Paul's sermon was minimally effective; they had shifted their thinking in the right direction.

Not all, however, mocked or deferred. Some believed. There were a number in Paul's audience who accepted his message and joined themselves to him. Kinsey writes:

> "Some men were glued to him" is what the original Greek is really trying to say in the passage "some men joined him." When a sermon glues anyone to the Lord of Life, that sermon is terrifically dynamic! From recently excavated tombstones of early Christians, we are certain that the Good News took root in Athens; the Church attracted all kinds of people as the occupations listed on the tombstones testify--physicians, coppersmiths, gravediggers, silkworkers, men skilled in the art of mosaics, etc.[93]

Two from this group of believers are specifically mentioned: Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris.

Dionysius was a member of the Council of the Areopagus, and hence a part of Athenian aristocracy. Lake and Cadbury assert:

> It is perhaps safe to infer from such data as we have that the council was small, perhaps about thirty. The members were taken from those who had held certain offices which would have been open only to the wealthy because of the expense they involved, and in fact the membership was practically limited to certain well-known families.[94]

The name of Dionysius occurs repeatedly in the pages of Christian tradition. Eusebius twice mentions a letter of Dionysius of Corinth which records that Dionysius the Areopagite became the first bishop of Athens:

> Dionysius, one of the ancients, the pastor of the diocese of the Corinthians, relates that the first bishop of the Church at Athens was that member of the Areopagus, the other Dionysius, whose original conversion after Paul's speech to the Atheneans in the Areopagus Luke described in the Acts.[95]

Niceophorus, another church historian, relates that the

Areopagite suffered a martyr's death in Athens during the reign of Domitian. A third account, obviously of legendary character, describes this Dionysius as being sent by Pope Clement I around A.D. 95 from Rome to Paris, where he was beheaded on Montmartre--a story which explains his being confused with St. Denys, the patron Saint of France. In the fifth and sixth centuries a series of mystical writings were circulated in his name, and exercised great influence on the church of the Middle Ages.[96]

As for Damaris, Ramsay suggests that she must have been "a foreign woman, perhaps one of the class of educated Hetairai," in view of the unlikelihood of an ordinary Athenian woman being present at any public meeting addressed by Paul.[97] Smith thinks she was a woman of ill-repute, converted from a life of shame:

> The name is apparently a variant of Damalis, which signifies "a heifer"; and since it is the sort of designation which was commonly borne by Athenian courtesans, and women of good fame lived in close seclusion, it is probable that she belonged to that numerous and unhappy order; and it may be taken as an evidence of her subsequent devotion that she was counted worthy of particular mention.[98]

Again, the inclusion of her name might be Luke's way of once more drawing attention to the appeal that the gospel has for men and women from all classes and conditions of life.[99]

These two, "and others with them,"[100] believed Paul's message, turned from their idols, and began to serve the one true God. Cave states, "To few, if any, modern missionaries has it been given to gain by a single speech any converts from an audience of dilettanti, interested in religious discussion, but without any sense of religious need."[101]

The Response of Paul.--Many have suggested that Paul also had a response to this sermon, and that his response was negative. They claim that the Apostle regretted the philosophical approach he took in Athens, that he considered it a failure, and that he abandoned it when he continued his ministry in Corinth. Ramsay expresses this view quite strongly, saying that Paul was apparently disappointed and perhaps disillusioned by his experience in Athens:

> He felt that he had gone at least as far as was right in the way of presenting his doctrine in a form suited to the current philosophy; and the result had been little more than naught. When he went on from Athens to Corinth, he no longer spoke in the philosophic style.[102]

Ramsay goes on to point out that afterwards, in replying to the unfavorable comparison of his preaching and the more philosophical style of Apollos, Paul told the Corinthians that he came among them "determined not to know anything save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified."[103] Furthermore,

> . . . nowhere throughout his writings is he so hard on the wise, the philosophers, and the dialecticians, as when he defends the way in which he had presented Christianity at Corinth.
>
> Apparently the greater concentration of purpose and simplicity of method in his preaching at Corinth is referred to by Luke, when he says (18:5) that when Silas and Timothy rejoined him there, they found him wholly possessed by and engrossed in the word.[104]

Ramsay concludes that there can be no question but that Paul's account in the opening chapters of First Corinthians shows a recoil from his plunge into philosophic techniques at Athens.

> "And I, brethren, when I came among you, came not announcing in superior language (as a rhetorician) or in superior wisdom (as a philosopher) the mysterious nature of God (as a knowledge reserved for the initiated few); for I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." What a contrast is that to the speech before the Areopagus, with its talk about the "Divine nature," and its silence about Jesus and the crucifixion (except in the obscure and nameless hint in xvii.31).[105]

Rackham says that at Athens Paul tried the wisdom of the world and found it lacking, so that when he went on to Corinth he determined not to try "excellency of speech or the persuasive words of wisdom," but to preach Christ crucified--what he had not proclaimed in Athens. "His disappointment at the failure of the former method to touch the frivolous Athenians no doubt kindled the fire with which he denounces the wisdom of the world in his first epistle to the Corinthians."[106]

This view enjoys some measure of popularity because of its apparent readiness to be content with the simple gospel rather than with a philosophical argument. The implication is that if Paul regretted his plunge into philosophical method and vowed never again to preach "with eloquent wisdom,"[107] then the contemporary preacher should also avoid such reasoning after the flesh, and should stick to a simple presentation of the gospel, knowing nothing except Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

But is it true that Paul responded negatively? Did he really change his approach at Corinth because of his failure at Athens? No, because a close consideration of the data reveals that the Apostle's message to the Athenians was an evangelistic and rhetorical success, and that it deserves to be a pattern for those who would speak to today's educated pagan.

In the first place, it is doubtful that Luke would have included this sermon in his account if either he or Paul considered it a failure. It is essential to Luke's own purposes as the author of Acts that this sermon be viewed as a typical and exemplary way of addressing the heathen. Luke reports many examples of apostolic preaching in showing how the ascended Lord brought His word to men and established His Church in the face of numerous obstacles. It is inconceivable that he would present an apostolic sermon which was designed to show how not to preach the gospel. It is particularly incomprehensible that the Areopagus address should be regarded in this light in view of the impressive way in which Luke records the sermon and the pains he takes to fully portray the historical setting. It is more easily understandable that he would include the message as "a characteristic example of a missionary sermon before Gentiles."[108] As Dibelius aptly states:

> In giving only one sermon addressed to Gentiles by the great Apostle to the Gentiles, namely the Areopagus speech in Athens, his primary purpose is to give an example of how the Christian missionary should approach cultured Gentiles.[109]

In the second place, Luke's description of Paul's preaching in Acts 18:5--"When Silas and Timothy arrived from Macedonia, Paul was occupied with preaching, testifying to the Jews that the Christ was Jesus"--is not meant to indicate, as Ramsay suggests, that Paul adopted a simpler, less philosophical approach in Corinth. Acts 18:5 is not designed as a contrast to Acts 17:16-34, but rather has meaning in its own context.

> (1) After this he left Athens and went to Corinth.
>
> (2) And found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla; (because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome) and came unto them.
>
> (3) And because he was of the same craft, he abode with them, and wrought: for by their occupation they were tentmakers.
>
> (4) And he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks.
>
> (5) And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in the spirit, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ.
>
> (6) And when they opposed themselves, and blasphemed, he shook his raiment and said unto them, your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean; from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles.

In this context, Lake and Cadbury explain verse 5 as a contrast to verse 4. In Acts 18:4, following a reference to Paul's labor with Aquila and Priscilla as tentmakers, Luke reports that the Apostle "argued in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded Jews and Greeks." This suggests to Lake and Cadbury that Paul had to work during the week and preached only on the Sabbath,[110] but when Silas and Timothy came to Corinth he was able to give up tentmaking and to occupy himself full-time with preaching. "Was this because Silas and Timothy earned enough for all three? Or had they brought funds from Macedonia?"[111]

Stonehouse, on the other hand, interprets verse 5 in the light of verse 6, thinking that the view of Lake and Cadbury is largely inferential since Luke doesnot qualify his reference to the preaching activity by saying that Paul could now engage in it every day. Stonehouse believes:

> Inasmuch as Luke says that Paul was occupied with preaching to the Jews when Silas and Timothy came to Corinth, and thus may be understood as virtually repeating the description of Paul's activity among the Jews in 18:5, it is more satisfactory to conclude that 18:5 is a resumé of 18:4 introduced in order to indicate that, as 18:6 immediately goes on to disclose, soon after the arrival of these men, the Jews turned so sharply against his mission that he turned to the Gentiles.[112]

Regardless of which of these explanations of Acts 18:5 is preferred, there is no foundation for the interpretation that Paul's being engrossed in preaching to the Jews reflects a rejection or modification of his message and method in preaching to the pagans in Athens.

In the third place, Paul's remarks in I Corinthians 2 have more to do with his oratorical style than with his philosophical content. His words are an explanation of his uniform speaking style, not an indication of any change of heart:

> And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God.
>
> For I determined not to know any thing among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.
>
> And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling.
>
> And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power:
>
> That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.[113]

Paul is not reflecting in this passage on his ministry in Athens, and expressing a new determination to know only "Jesus Christ and Him crucified" in contrast to a philosophically oriented message. He is certainly not repenting of his references to Greek poets, for in this very epistle (I Corinthians 15:33) he quotes from the *Thais* of Menander. Rather, he is reminding the Corinthians that when he spoke among them his oratorical style did not follow the fashion of the day. He is emphasizing that, whether at Athens or at Corinth, he did not employ the "lofty words or wisdom" that were so common among contemporary orators. He did not imitate the current inflated style, but instead used a simple style and relied on the Spirit and power of God.

To fully understand Paul's comments it is necessary to remember that by the middle of the first century A.D., Greek oratory had focused almost exclusively on the matter of style. The rhetoric of Paul's day was almost totally preoccupied with the ornamental aspects of public speaking. This preoccupation can best be seen by reviewing (1) the treatises that were being written, (2) The Asiatic-Atticist controversy that was raging, and (3) the Second Sophistic movement that was emerging, and was discussed generally in Chapter II.

For several centuries prior to Paul, the subject of speech style had been receiving more and more attention in the rhetorical treatises being written. In the fourth century B.C., Aristotle dealt only briefly with the matter in the third book of his Rhetoric. But from this modest beginning the element of style soon came to dominate the theoretical works of classical authors. Half of the Rhetorica ad Herennium (86 B.C.) is devoted to the kinds and qualities of style. Most of Cicero's attention in his De Oratore (58 B.C.), De Optimo Genere Oratorum (46 B.C.), Brutus (46 B.C.), and Orator (46 B.C.) is directed to stylistic matters. At the turn of the first century, this one aspect of speaking is the total concern of Dionysius' On Literary Composition, Longinus' On the Sublime, and Demetrius' On Style. In other words, the matter of speech style, initially only a limited segment of the literature, became by the time of Paul the dominating feature of classical theory.

As has been noted, certain historical and political factors accounted for this concentration on stylistic theories. As Greek democracy faded and power became concentrated in the hands of the imperial authorities, popular assemblies became both infrequent and perfunctory, since their decisions could be altered at any moment. Pleading in the courts was simultaneously restricted. As a result, the voice of the orator no longer had any force in legislative or judicial matters, and his only remaining outlet as a public speaker was the ceremonial oratory of special occasions. Baldwin describes the narrowing of the field of public address:

> Of the three fields of oratory distinguished by Aristotle, deliberative, forensic, and occasional, the first was restricted by political changes. It faded with democracy. Later it faded at Rome, and still later in other realms. Deliberative oratory presupposes free discussion and audiences that vote. The steady increase of government from above administered by an appointed official class hastened also the tendency of the second kind of oratory, forensic, to become technical, the special art of legal pleading. Thus the only field left free was the third, occasional oratory, encomium, or panegyric, the commemoration of persons and days, the address of welcome, the public lecture.[114]

This narrowing of the field of oratory had a concomitant effect on the focus of rhetorical theory. Since only the innocuous and utterly predictable inanities of ceremonial occasions were open to the orator, and since his success on such occasions would depend more on how he spoke than on what he spoke, it was only natural that the theorists would turn their attention to that which had the most immediate and utilitarian value--the treatment of rhetorical style. As the subject of style became of paramount theoretical interest, there arose a dispute known as the Asiatic-Atticist controversy. The quarrel between the Asianists and

Atticists was largely over the relative merits of the plain and grand styles.

The rhetorical theory of the day recognized three different oratorical styles--the plain, the middle, and the grand. Each of these is described by Cicero in his Orator. According to Cicero, the plain style orator is "to the point, explaining everything and making every point clear rather than impressive, using a refined, concise style stripped of ornament."[115] He follows the "ordinary usage," uses "plain and simple" words, and avoids "the charm and richness of figurative ornament."[116] He is free from the "bonds of rhythm," "modest" in metaphor, and not "bold in coining words."[117] "His delivery is not that of tragedy nor of the stage; he will employ only slight movements of the body, but will trust a great deal to his expression."[118] His speech, however, is "sprinkled with the salt of pleasantry," i.e., with humor and wit.[119]

"The second style is fuller and somewhat more robust than the simple style just described."[120] This middle style contains "a minimum of vigour, and a maximum of charm. For it is richer than the unadorned style, but plainer than the ornate and opulent style."[121] It uses neither the intellectual appeal of the former, nor the fiery force of the latter:

> Akin to both, excelling in neither, sharing in both, or, to tell the truth, sharing in neither, this style keeps the proverbial "even tenor if its way," bringing nothing except ease and uniformity, or at most

> adding a few posies as in a garland, and diversifying the whole speech with simple ornaments of thought and diction.[122]

The orator of the third style is "magnificent, opulent, stately and ornate."[123] His eloquence "rushes along with the roar of a mighty stream," and has "power to sway men's minds and move them in every possible way."[124] The grand orator shows "splendid power of thought and majesty of diction," and he is "forceful, versatile, copious and grave, trained and equipped to arouse and sway the emotions."[125]

The orators of Asia Minor preferred the florid, luxuriant, and bombastic rhetoric of the grand style. The Atticists favored the plain style, which was characterized by clearness, simplicity, and restraint. The best of the controversy belongs to the latter half of the first century B.C., and is reflected in the works of Cicero and Quintilian.[126] The important point to note here is that by the time of Paul, the Greek world had been split into two camps; those who favored the elegant and pure style associated with Athens and Corinth, and those who preferred the flowery and redundant prose that came out of Ephesus and the cities of Asia.

These two phenomena--the theoretical preoccupation with style, and the Asiatic-Atticist controversy--eventually culminated in an era of Greek oratory known as the Second Sophistic. The Second Sophistic can best be described as the triumph of the Asiatic school:

> The second half of the first century saw the development of "the second Sophistic" which can best be described as the triumph of display oratory mainly in the Greek part of the empire and especially in the province of Asia.[127]

The oratory of this period was committed to the extravagances of the grand style. Whereas Aristotle had conceived of rhetoric as the art of giving effectiveness to the truth, the Second Sophistics saw it only as a means of giving effectiveness to the speaker:

> The sophist was over-expressive lest for a moment he should cease to be impressive. The audience need not be held to any course of thought; it must not be held too long by any one device of style; but it must unflaggingly admire. It must be spellbound. The constant implication of Philostratus probably echoes the ideal of orator and audience alike: behold a great speaker![128]

It mattered little whether the speaker had a purpose in speaking, for the glory of the speech was an end in itself:

> For the composition of the whole speech sophistic generally had little care. That planned sequence, that leading on of the mind from point to point, which is the habit of great orators and the chief means of cogency, presupposes urgency toward a goal. Sophists often had no goal. The audience need be won only to admiration, not to decision.[129]

The mark of the Second Sophistic is that it "reduced rhetoric to style,"[130] and made the speaker more important than the speech.

This, then, was the state of oratory in the middle of the first century A.D.: the theorists had been focusing on the single element of style, the orators had been polarized into two stylistic factions, and the Asiatic devotees of the grand style were beginning to dominate. It is against the backdrop of these trends that Paul writes to the Corinthians saying that he "came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom," but was determined to know nothing except "Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." "And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."[131] He had not come with the flowery words and elaborate style of an Asiatic orator; rather, he had spoken in the straightforward style associated with their own Attic region. Nor had he been, as a Sophistic orator would have been, more concerned about his own image than about the substance of his speech. On the contrary, his presence among them had been nothing and the substance of his speech had been everything; he had been with them in fear and trembling. Wherever he preached, whether at Athens or Corinth, the style and substance of his message was such that men's faith "should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

It is instructive to compare Paul's rejection of excellency of speech and inconsequential substance with Eunapius' description of the Sophistic orator Maximus:

> Maximus is one of the older and more learned students, who, because of his lofty genius and superabundant eloquence scorned all logical proof.[132]

Plato likewise criticizes verbosity and excess which hinders the process of discussion.[133] These references further substantiate the idea that in I Corinthians 2:1-5

Paul is talking about oratorical style and not philosophical content.

The point of I Corinthians 2:1-5, therefore, is not that Paul was sorry for his approach at Athens and determined to do differently at Corinth. Instead, his remarks are a reminder of his continual determination to preach in a clear and cogent style, and to emphasize the message rather than the speaker.

There is a final reason for discarding the idea that Paul was disappointed with his preaching at Athens. His Athenian sermon ought to be considered a successful example for contemporary preaching, not only because the literary purpose of Luke requires it, and because Acts 18 and I Corinthians 2 do not suggest otherwise, but also because of the results he did gain. The number of those who responded to Paul's message was not as small as some would imagine. Luke's language is sufficient to envision a goodly crowd. "Certain men clave unto him." Considering the circumstances this response was all the more remarkable, for as Sydney Cave so aptly observes: "None are harder to convert than those to whom religion is primarily a topic of speculative interest, and, judged by the standards of modern missionary experience, Saint Paul's visit to Athens was not a failure, but a success."[134]

Originally, the Athenian attitude toward Paul was one of slightly contemptuous indulgence. It is remarkable, then, that any of his audience was willing to break with the popular views of Athens and share the ignominy and disdain attached to the wandering Jew. That a member of the Areopagus Council should be among those willing to do so ought to be evidence enough of the sermon's effectiveness and of Paul's satisfaction with it. Wilbur Smith comments:

> Some were saved that day, which would be a dual miracle, considering the audience he had to speak to. There were even a few of the notable people of the city who believed, as a result of Paul's address. Would to God that on every occasion that you or I had ever spoken it could be said that some believed, noble or ignoble![135]

Paul left Athens, therefore, with the confidence that he had faithfully ministered in the Spirit, and with the expectation that the fruits of his labor would remain and redound to the glory of God.

The experience of Paul at Athens confirmed that the gospel had indeed been intended for all, and could be well received by the Gentiles as well as the Jews. A milestone in Christian history was passed. The process had begun which would tear Christianity loose from its Jewish exclusiveness and make it a universal movement for all men. "Through the preaching of Paul, Christianity was moved by both example and persecution out of Jerusalem into the rest of the Roman world with a universal message to both Jews and Gentiles. While Rome herself was even more hostile to Christianity than was Jerusalem, many Jews and Gentiles everywhere received the new faith."[136]

The Appropriateness of the Theme to the Occasion and Audience

Content analysis, as a research technique, says Redding, "is basically a close, sentence-by-sentence scrutiny of oral or written discourse for the purpose of determining what kinds of 'meanings' the words may represent."[137] Content may be divided into "themes"--substance, and into "form." Form has to do with how a speaker presents his ideas, with emphasis on persuasive techniques and style. Content analysis, along with the extrinsic-historical approach, is a powerful aid toward understanding all that a speaker says.[138]

As the theme of this speech is analyzed, an attempt will be made to compare the content with the thinking and status of the audience. To what extent does the speaker adapt himself and his message to the ascertainable facts relating to the composition of the audience?[139]

Stonehouse remarks that Paul is a master of oration at Athens, who knows exactly how to suit his message to a distinctive and challenging situation.[140] Whereas at Antioch Paul speaks to the chiefly uneducated heathen, at Athens he speaks to the educated heathen, and so changes his approach in accordance with Cicero's declaration that a speaker should vary his approach depending on whether the men are educated or uneducated, cultured or uncultured. Paul is cognizant of the points of tangency and divergence between his beliefs and those of the audience. He, therefore, seeks for a position of commonality from which to begin, so that discussion is possible. As has been noted, he chooses the Greek philosophical tradition for the common basis from which he will speak.

Thus, this sermon is "a speech appropriate to Athens only."[141] Every aspect of the message is designed for this particular audience in this particular city. A rhetorical analysis reveals that the theme is uniquely suited to the thoughts and interests of a pagan Greek, and is deliberately chosen in order that the Apostle might best turn these Athenians from their idolatrous worship. Paul speaks to the needs of the audience--a method approved by Quintilian.[142]

The sermon's theme is that God is the Creator of the universe and of men. Some question Paul's choice of this theme on the grounds that it says nothing of the death of Christ or of salvation through Him. They wonder whether the sermon is something less than a well-rounded Christian proclamation of the gospel, despite the fact that its content is quite unobjectionable. Dibelius, for example, quite pointedly charges that the concluding sentence is:

> . . . the only Christian sentence in the Areopagus speech. At last Jesus is alluded to, even though his name is not actually used. The reference to his resurrection and the proclamation of a judgment by him are the only specifically Christian ideas which are imparted to the hearers.[143]

Some try to lessen the force of this objection by claiming that Paul is interrupted before he can complete his sermon. They suggest that a clamor erupts at the mention of the resurrection which prevents the Apostle from finishing what he intends to say about Christ:

> At this point the patience of his hearers was exhausted. It is evident that Paul had not reached the height of his argument. He spoke of the judge, but not of the Savior; testified of repentance toward God, but not of faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ. That would have been the next step in the unfolding of the discourse, if he had been suffered to proceed.[144]

However, there is no real evidence for supposing that Paul's sermon is curtailed in any way. The audience seems too curious and interested to interrupt the speaker. They have asked to hear specifically about his new teaching, a teaching which they know has something to do with "Jesus" and "Resurrection." Since, as has been noted, the Athenians made gods out of abstractions, the philosophers must have thought Paul to be preaching the god Jesus and the god Resurrection,[145] or that he was preaching "foreign demons" because the demons worshipped by the Greeks were considered as dead men deified.[146] After having been misunderstood by the philosophers when he preached in the marketplace, Paul now gives some theological background for the gospel of Jesus so that he can explain how and where the resurrection of Jesus comes in. Surely his audience would hear him out to the end, let him say all he would, and then mock, reject, question, or accept as they saw fit. There is no hint in Luke's account that the ridicule which some heaped on the idea of a resurrection was anything other than a vocalized response by a segment of the audience at the conclusion of the message.

Even beyond this lack of evidence in the narrative, there is also the very unity of the sermon itself which prevents its being viewed as a truncated address. The composition and development of the message forms an intended whole: introductory reference to idolatry, major points in opposition to idolatry, and concluding appeal to repent of idolatry. "There is," as Dibelius notes, "an intentional harmony between the beginning and the end."[147]

Others answer the charge that this is not a Christian sermon by arguing that there probably was more gospel included in the message than meets the eye. They take account, correctly, of the compressed and abbreviated nature of the reports of the sermons in Acts. Stonehouse, for example, notes:

> If one once recognizes that the addresses must be regarded as condensed accounts of speeches that lasted considerably longer than the time it takes us to read them through, one may be prepared to face the question whether the several reports, while indicating accurately the disposition and contents of the addresses in summary form, do not imply as much as they actually state. As applied to the situation confronting us here, this observation suggests that Luke means to imply that the message of salvation through Christ is being intimated in epitome in Paul's proclamation of the divine command that all men everywhere should repent.[148]

Stonehouse then proceeds to "read between the lines" of verses 30 and 31, showing that Paul's full remarks might well have included an adequate exposition of the wrath to come, the days of grace and salvation, the works worthy of repentance, and the necessity of being assured of a favorable relationship to Christ.[149]

It seems reasonable to suppose that the full version of Paul's sermon did have some additional information about the life and death of Christ. The fact remains, however, that whether in abbreviated form or in expanded proportions, the bulk of the sermon concerns the knowledge of God and not the knowledge of Christ, and that it has been accurately represented. In the speech at Athens Luke has incorporated Paul's thoughts from several of his epistles; Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, and Second Thessalonians. Such construction would certainly point to Luke's "inspired accuracy," as well as to his remarkable ability to represent the Apostle so precisely. Gardner, in his "Speeches of St. Paul in Acts," gives an excellent comparison of the speech at Athens with Paul's epistles. He maintains that Luke had no access to Paul's epistles, which renders the comparison even more remarkable.[150]

The fact that Paul's sermon at Athens is more about God than about Christ is as it should be, and reveals that the Apostle knows what is appropriate for this particular audience at this particular moment. His choice of a theme is not an embarrassment, but rather an indication of his own skill as a speaker and an evangelist. Paul knows that if he begins with a proclamation of a crucified Jesus he may only succeed in adding one more idol to the Athenian pantheon. This is the very confusion that began to arise from his witness in the agora, causing some to conclude him to be "a preacher of foreign divinities." As he mounts the steps of the Areopagus it must become apparent to the Apostle that a stable Christian faith can never be erected until the idolatrous foundation of Athenian religion is broken up. Human conduct cannot be changed without first a recognition of the present pattern's weakness. Paul realizes that he must first break the hold of the Athenians' devotion to images before he can wed them to Christ. He wisely chooses, therefore, to direct his message against the inconsistencies and assumptions of idolatry, and he selects a theme which will correct their conceptions and give them the knowledge of the true God. This approach is not unique to the Athenian sermon. In I Thessalonians 1:9, 10, the order of Paul's wording also suggests that an idolatrous Gentile must come first to a knowledge of God, and then to a knowledge of Christ.

> For they themselves shew of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God:
>
> And to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come.

Acts 20:21 further states:

> Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward Jesus Christ.

And again, Acts 26:20:

> But shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and

> then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance.

Paul's theme, then, is admirably calculated as an introductory lesson in Christianity for cultured pagans. The scoffers have been given something to scoff at, the merely inquisitive have heard enough for a first time, while those who have been inwardly touched to repentance will soon learn more of the salvation that is in Christ.

The Structure of the Sermon

Specific questions to be raised now are: How does Paul argue his case? What different methods and proofs did the Apostle use in this speech? Are these approaches unique? Is the plan of arrangement accommodated to the audience situation? The critic is interested in finding out "whether the speaker's conception of his task--be it to explain, to entertain, to convince, or to persuade--is clear, and whether the selection and arrangement of the ideas conduce to their effectiveness."[151]

Following Cicero's stress that the method of arrangement should always be adapted to the purpose of the speech, Paul adapts his message to the purpose that pagan listeners on the Areopagus should learn of the one true God, for the Apostle knows the truth of Cicero's statement, "No single kind of oratory suits every audience."[152]

The most perfect and complete form of argument, according to the author of the Ad Herennium, is a five-fold one consisting of "propositio, a statement of what we are about to prove; ratio, a brief exposition of our argument; confirmatio, a confirmation of this by a number of proofs; exornatio, embellishment; and complexio, summing up."[153]

Propositio:	The God you do not know, "Him declare I unto you."
Ratio:	There is only one God, Creator of the universe and men, and he dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is worshipped with men's hands.
Confirmatio:	Proofs, using the words of Greek poets and philosophers where these point to the true relation between the sovereign Creator and his creatures.
Exornatio:	Embellishment by literary quotations and philosophical allusions, together with the use of classical syntax and Greek terminology.
Complexio:	A summation or conclusion: God once winked at the ignorance of idolatry but now commands men to repent and prepare for righteous judgment.

Quintilian's prescription for composition is to know the theory of rhetoric and to apply arrangement, for to him the theory of rhetoric is sufficient to provide one's material: "If one approaches the business of composition in a natural manner, considering what the theme demands . . . nature herself prescribes one's opening and what follows."[154] Using Quintilian's prescribed "good judgment," Paul opens with a consideration of the opinion the audience has already formed, and thus speaks of their UNKNOWN GOD. Then he presents first those topics of argument with which he knows his audience will agree, saving the resurrection from the dead until last. One can easily trace in the Apostle's speech

Quintilian's concept of "nature methodised"; governed by good judgment and theories of rhetoric, with the matter drawn from the theme.

Paul chooses his matter and each word in accordance with the theme of his message. "But as for you, speak the things which are fitting for sound doctrine,"[155] and "there must be no filthiness and silly talk, or coarse jesting, which are not fitting."[156] In such statements the Apostle emphasizes the importance of carefully choosing each word. His sermon at Athens epitomizes his philosophy of communication in that each word adds to the thrust of the message, moving the hearer in a logical progression from point to point. Paul readily perceives that his own authority and the truthfulness of his teaching are under suspicion, and that confirmation of these must be brought about by a closely reasoned explanation of the relationship between the philosophy of the Greeks and Natural Theology which is the foundation of the Christian Gospel.

Practically all the speeches in Acts show evidence of having been thought out beforehand. Their substance is well-mastered. Paul knows he will probably be called upon to speak in the synagogues he visits, and in the case of his messages before the Jews and the Greeks he must realize all along that he will have to say something to answer charges or questions brought to him. It appears that he has gone through the five speech processes of classical rhetoric in preparing his sermon at Athens, as well as at Antioch. According to Cicero, the following steps were necessary in preparing any oration:

> First, to find out what he should say; next to dispose and arrange his matter, not only in a certain order, but with a sort of power and judgment; then to clothe and deck his thoughts with language; then to secure them in his memory; and lastly to deliver them with dignity and grace.[157]

Paul arranges his material "with a sort of power and judgment," beginning with the exordium or introduction and going on through each point of systematic argument. He uses the customary salutation: "Men of Athens." This is "the form of address common with the Attic orators and constantly occurring in the speeches of Demosthenes."[158] The phrase instantly reveals knowledge of an appropriate and, therefore, effective beginning, and probably knowledge of the Attic orators' speeches, also. Paul has thought out "what he should say" as an introduction, and in his speech, and clothes his words, and their order or arrangement, with dignity and grace of delivery.

Following his salutation, Paul acknowledges the extraordinary religiosity of his listeners, that in every way they are "very religious." Their devotion to the gods has impressed him.

One important function of the introduction is to establish good speaking relations with the listeners.[159] Clark says that the introduction, or exordium, according to the ancients, traditionally had three aims: to make the audience well-disposed, attentive, and willing to receive information. That is, to conciliate the audience.[160] Paul faced an especially difficult problem in this regard. As has already been noted, the tone of his audience, while formally polite, carried an undercurrent of contempt. Many listeners doubtless considered him to be intellectually inferior, and wondered at his audacity in presuming to teach the philosophers of Athens. Paul must have realized the problem as he faced his audience, and because he did so, was able to meet the problem.

> A speaker who anticipates hostility will prepare to meet it. He will remind himself that he must behave with patience and reasonableness. He will avoid being disputatious. He will plan his speech so as to create an atmosphere that favors open-mindedness.[161]

Virginia Holland points out that Kenneth Burke, in an analysis of rhetorical criticism, calls for an examination of the speaker's strategies.[162] Paul's strategies, in his introduction and in what follows it, exemplify the rhetorical function described by Donald Bryant as "the function of adjusting ideas to people and of people to ideas."[163] The Apostle understood the character of his listeners and did not begin his speech by denouncing or upbraiding them, or by thinking that they could be convinced simply by dogmatic assertion. Instead, he took advantage of their pride in their religious fame and gained common ground with them, earning their goodwill by acknowledging this fact in the introduction. He maintains their attention, favor, and willingness to receive information by indicating that he is impressed with the fact that they are "very religious." Further on in his message he recognizes the pagan contributions to truth.

The word often translated "superstitious" or "very religious" properly means reverence for the gods or demons. It is used by the classic writers in a good sense, "to denote piety towards the gods, or a suitable fear and reverence for them; and also in a bad sense, to denote improper fear or excessive dread of their anger."[164] It could be that since the word had a double meaning to Paul's audience, it held interest because of a desire to see in which sense the Apostle used it.

Generally, Paul's method is conciliatory. He begins his speech on a note of goodwill. He sincerely recognizes the Athenians' religious instincts--that every idol shows desire for God and every temple demonstrates man's need of worship. But instead of saying "idols" in Acts 17:14, he speaks of "the objects of your worship." His desire is to turn the good instinct and habit of worship in the right direction. He is there to speak of the God to Whom they have already erected an altar. Paul knows it will seem presumptuous for an unknown Jew to try to instruct the great minds of Athens, but by this altar they have confessed ignorance, and by commending it Paul gains more common ground. At least for the moment they are now well-disposed toward him, attentive, and willing to receive information. This exordium is of the insinuatio or indirect approach, recommended by classical rhetoricians for a speaker whose position is not necessarily one of favor.[165] Further, by saying, "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you," Paul has presented his propositio, perhaps thus preparing his knowledgeable audience for the most perfect form of argument according to the author of the *Ad Herennium*.

The overall theme and introduction are not the only aspects of this sermon that are suited to an Athenian assembly. The materials which support that theme, and make up its development and the structure of the speech, are also deliberately chosen because of their appropriateness to an audience of cultured pagans. The message begins with the Athenians' own confessed ignorance of the divine nature. It then continues with an exposition of the true knowledge of God, applying this knowledge to the practice of idolatry; and it ends with an introduction to the Judge of God's choosing Who will hold men accountable for their knowledge of God. This sermon is Paul's initial proclamation. (The second sermon might well begin where this one stopped; with an explanation of Who this divinely-appointed Man is, and why He was raised from the dead.) For the present, however, the Apostle carefully picks those subordinate thoughts and ideas which an educated Greek will most readily accept as evidence for the doctrine of God as Creator. As has been noted, Paul uses deductive reasoning: the method used by the Stoics. "The intellectual element, insofar as its function is to convince others of the truth of the proposition advanced, appears mainly in the form of argument. All arguments may be classified as belonging to either of two kinds, deductive or inductive."[166] This is a deliberative address, not forensic or epideictic, for it urges a course of action for the benefit and future welfare and security of the listeners: Repent and believe. It also presents this action as praiseworthy and right. (As noted, the division of the three types of oratory goes back to Aristotle,[167] though he probably did not invent it himself.) The aptness of Paul's structure of supporting materials can best be seen by first examining his poetic quotations and his philosophical allusions. With these, which hold great interest for his listeners, Paul reveals an amazing familiarity.

The Poetic Quotations.--On occasion Cicero even quotes poetry in his speeches. He and Quintilian believe that the practice pleases the audience, reveals that the speaker is knowledgeable and intelligent, and enables the sentiments of the poet to be used as witnesses to support the orator's statements.[168] Therefore, it is perfectly acceptable, even pleasing to Paul's listeners that the structure of his speech should include poetic quotations to support his assertions, a common practice among Greek rhetoricians.

Paul's method in supporting his assertion that God "is really not far from each one of us," is to quote two Greek authors, submitting their writings as proof of the intimate relationship that exists between God and men. These quotations occur midway through his second point, and one--"For we are also his offspring"--[169] has long been recognized as a direct quote from the Phaenomena of Aratus. A very similar line, "For we are your offspring," occurs in the Hymn to Zeus by the Stoic Cleanthes, a contemporary of Aratus. Aratus was a Stoic, and highly esteemed of the Greeks. He was a Cilician poet, one of Saint Paul's own countrymen, and with his writings Saint Paul was undoubtedly well acquainted, though he had flourished about 300 years before the Apostle's time. The Phaenomena, a treatise on astronomy written between 276-274 B.C., was an extremely popular work among the ancients. It was used as a textbook for generations, with many commentaries being written on it. It was even translated into Latin by Cicero and others, and included writings about the seven planets and the twelve signs.[170] The line which Paul cites is from the poem's introduction, which eulogizes the deity as the father and benefactor of men:

> From Zeus let us begin; him do we mortals never leave unnamed; full of Zeus are all the streets and all the market-places of men; full is the sea and the heavens thereof; always we all have need of Zeus. For we are also his offspring; and he in his kindness unto men giveth favourable signs and wakeneth the people to work, reminding them of livelihood. He tells what time the soil is best for the labour of the ox and for the

> mattock, and what time the seasons are favourable both for the planting of trees and for casting all manner of seeds. For himself it was who set the signs in heaven, and marked out the constellations, and for the year devised what stars chiefly should give to men right signs of the seasons, to the end that all things might grow unfailingly. Wherefore him do men ever worship first and last. Hail, O Father, mighty marvel, mighty blessing unto men.[171]

Another version of this poem, written in rhyme and addressed to Jove, is found in Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, 2. 59. 1ff.:

> With Jove we must begin; nor from him rove;
> Him always praise, for all is full of Jove!
> He fills all places where mankind resort,
> The wide-spread sea, with every shelt-ring port.
> Jove's presence fills all space, upholds his ball;
> All need his aid; his power sustains us all.
> For we his offspring are; and he in love
> points out to man his labour from above;
> Where signs unerring show when best the soil,
> By well-timed cultures, shall repay our toil. . . .

It is interesting to note in passing that Aratus, like Paul, sees the seasons of nature as evidence of the power and goodness of the deity. Perhaps Paul knew that his earlier point about God's "establishing the fixed times" would cause his audience to think of this poem and to anticipate a quote from it.

Paul's second quotation is "In him we live and move and have our being." These words can be identified as part of a poem by Epimenides the Cretan, a fact which is interesting for two reasons. For one thing, Epimenides was supposed, in Greek legends, to have advised the erection of "anonymous altars" in and around Athens. For another thing, in order to identify the line with Epimenides it is necessary to put together many bits and pieces.

First, Paul's explanatory expression, "as certain also of your own poets have said," is sandwiched in between his two quotations of poetry, so that his explanation looks backward and forward. Evidence for this fact can be found in both Athanasius and Augustine, who attach the clause to the words that have preceded, and not to the quotation from Aratus. As Athanasius states:

> All things derive from the Word their light and movement and life, as the Gentile authors themselves say, "In Him we live and move and have our being."[172]

Augustine further says:

> And to the Athenians thou saidest by the Apostle, that in thee we live and move and have our being, as certain of their own poets have said.[173]

These two citations demonstrate that the line quoted was recognized in the early centuries as part of Greek poetry.

Second, a ninth-century Syriac commentary on Acts includes the words "In Him we live and move and have our being" as part of a poem in which the Cretans are described as "liars, evil beasts, idle bellies" because they said about Zeus, as if it were true, that he was a prince, and was lacerated by a wild boar, and was buried, and his grave was among them. In the poem, Minos, the son of Zeus, makes a panegyric over his father, saying:

> The Cretans have fashioned a tomb for thee, O Holy and
>   High:
> Liars, evil beasts, idle bellies;
> For thou diest not, for ever thou livest and standest;
> For in thee we live and move and have our being.[174]

Third, one immediately recognizes the second line of this panegyric, "liars, evil beasts, idle bellies," as a phrase which the Apostle Paul attributes to a Cretan author in Titus 1:12:

> One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said "Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle bellies."

Fourth, Clement of Alexandria says that in Titus 1:12 Paul is quoting the Cretan author Epimenides:

> . . . Epimenides the Cretan, whom Paul knew as a Greek prophet, whom he mentions in the Epistle to Titus, where he speaks thus: "One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said, The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle bellies."[175]

Finally, Diogenes Laertius mentions among the works of Epimenides a long poem entitled On Minos and Rhadamanthus. Possibly this is the work in which Epimenides had Minos pronounce the panegyric, although the lines have also been assigned to Epimenides' epic poem The Oracles, Fragment 1, Diels-Kranz.[176]

To summarize, the words "In Him we live and move and have our being" were recognized early as a part of Greek poetry containing a familiar description of the Cretans, and attributed to a Cretan author elsewhere identified as Epimenides. Corroboration of this identification is achieved by noting a pertinent title among Epimenides' published works, and the assignment of the lines to one of his epic poems.

Both of the lines Paul recites, therefore, are poetic quotations. The importance of this becomes apparent when it is realized that Paul cites these Greek authors in support of his claim that God is very near to men. The words of the Athenians' own poets, considered to be authorities, prove that there is an intimate descending relationship between God and men. Therefore, in view of this evidence from their own literature, the Athenians ought not to think of God as an image of gold, silver, or stone.

Today we are not accustomed to citing poetry as evidence of the truthfulness of statements; verse is more often used to embellish specific points or to give them emotional force. However, this was not so with the ancients. In the estimation of the Athenians, their poets were prophets, and credited with mantic gifts as well as with literary skills.[177] Paul himself refers to Epimenides as a "prophet" in Titus 1:12. Because poets were believed to be inspired by the gods, appeal to them as a form of religion was persuasively effective, and in the structure of argument, the words of a poet constituted adequate factual support for an assertion, and were frequently used by speakers. Aristotle records that even judicial disputes were sometimes settled by references to "the poets and men of repute whose judgments are known to all."[178]

It is appropriate, wise, and effective, therefore, that in the structure of his message Paul uses poetic quotations to prove his points. It is an indication of his skill as a speaker that he would choose such supporting material for his sermon. These poets express thoughts which, despite the pagan contexts in which they are conceived, indicate a real if limited apprehension of the true God the Apostle has come to proclaim. Paul does not quote from the Old Testament as he did at Pisidian Antioch, but rather picks that which will be convincing to an educated Athenian. His choice of poetic quotations are further evidence of his continual desire to adapt every aspect of his preaching to the unique characteristics of a particular audience.

The Philosophical Allusions.--There is in the structure of Paul's sermon a second type of support material, also chosen for its appropriateness to the immediate listeners. Paul buttresses his points, not only with poetry, but also with suitable allusions to the tenets of Stoic and Epicurean philosophy. In this method he is like Cicero whose speeches reveal that the Roman orator was familiar with the main tenets of Stoicism and Epicureanism and could knowledgeably criticize them. It was especially difficult for Paul to use references to both Epicureanism and Stoicism, though they held several doctrines in common, because they were violently opposed to one another. McGarvey says, "the two classes of philosophers which he encountered were the antipodes of each other."[179] The technique of altering from one segment of the audience to the other in points of agreement and disagreement was necessary if Paul was to hold both segments of his audience. When Paul set forth the concept of a God-creator, he was stating a near truism for the Stoic. Though the Stoic would not accept Paul's idea of the personality and work of God, he could accept the idea that there was a God-organizer. The Epicurean, on the other hand, though he would deny the God-creator concept, would welcome Paul's trilogy of negative truths about God. He believed that no service done by man was of any consequence to the gods, and he ridiculed worship as engaged in by the Stoics. Paul said all men have been "made of one blood," trying, by this affirmation, perhaps, to convince the Greeks that he regarded them all as brethren, unlike many of the prejudiced people of his own race. Epicurus, however, was opposed to the idea of universal brotherhood. He saw the culmination of happiness in friendship, but also assumed his followers would choose as friends only Epicureans.[180] To the Stoic, all men were part of a perfect Order, a rational and, therefore, good universe. Stoics could accept Paul's tenet.

Hearing that God does not dwell in earthly temples, the Epicurean might suppose that he heard the language of his own teacher. But the next sentence, which asserts the providence of God as the active, creative energy and the ruling, ordaining principle, if accepted, would annihilate the atomic theory and the government of blind chance to which Epicurus ascribed the origin and preservation of the universe. When the Stoic heard Paul say men ought to rise to an understanding of God without the intervention of earthly objects, it might have seemed like an echo of his own thought, until he learned that Paul spoke of a personal God Who gives direction to men through revelation of His will.[181] In presenting a point that the Stoics could agree with and then one that Epicureans could agree with, Paul kept from losing his audience as he progressed through His argument.

The idea on which there would be much disagreement, the resurrection of the dead, was not mentioned until the end of the speech. By the first century B.C., men were regulating their lives without any serious conviction of the rewards or punishments of a future state. "At the bar and in the senate of Rome the ablest orators were not apprehensive of giving offense to their hearers by exposing that doctrine as an idle and extravagant opinion, which was rejected with contempt by every man of a liberal education and understanding."[182] Festus, before whom Paul was tried, in thinking a man mad who held the resurrection of the dead to be a possibility, was quite representative of the thinking of the pagan world.[183] Still, when Paul came to his final argument, with which neither segment in his audience could agree, he had no further recourse unless he took away the true significance and importance of this point, which he was not willing to do.

With representatives of both philosophic schools in his audience (Acts 17:18), the Apostle displays an approach to philosophical ideas which is otherwise not found in the New

Testament. Paul criticizes idolatry only with arguments that have been commonplace in philosophical Greek thought since the days of Xenophanes in the sixth century B.C.[184] It is evident that Paul is echoing the Hellenistic teaching of Stephen in Acts 7:48-50.

> Howbeit the most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands, as saith the prophet, "Heaven is my throne and earth is my footstool: what house will ye build me? saith the Lord: or what is the place of my rest? Hath not my hand made all these things?"

On the positive side, he does not advance doctrines that are distinctly Jewish, such as that of the Messiah, nor any that might prove a stumbling block, such as the crucifixion, but he first lays down the fundamental principles of natural theology: the doctrines of God as Creator of the world, Ruler and Preserver, omnipresent and immanent; and for each of these doctrines he finds support in some one of the philosophies.

As an educated citizen of the world, it would have been impossible for Paul not to have come into contact with the major philosophies of his time. Strabo points out that these systems of thought were especially prevalent in Paul's hometown of Tarsus:

> The people at Tarsus have devoted themselves so eagerly not only to philosophy, but also to the whole round of education in general that they have surpassed Athens, Alexandria, or any other place that can be named where there have been schools and lectures of philosophers.[185]

Given the Apostle's own intelligent and penetrating mind, it is not surprising that he should be able to use "the outer garment of Greek philosophy in order to clothe and present Christianity in expressions and terms familiar to the human intelligence of his era."[186] An examination of his two major points will reveal the extent of these philosophical echoes.

Paul's first point, that God is the Creator of the universe, is developed with the following ideas: God is the source of all life, He is not confined in temples, and He needs nothing in the way of human service. All of these thoughts have their counterparts in the writings of Greek philosophers. Diogenes Laertius quotes the Stoics as teaching that the deity is the giver and sustainer of life:

> The deity, say they, is a living being, immortal, rational, perfect or intelligent in happiness, admitting nothing evil into him, taking providential care of the world and all that therein is, but he is not of human shape. He is, however, the artificer of the universe and, as it were, the father of all, both in general and in that particular part of him which is all-pervading, and which is called many names according to its various powers.[187]

Seneca likewise insists that a man "will never make sufficient progress until he has conceived a right idea of God--regarding Him as one who possesses all things, and allots all things, and bestows them without price."[188]

Seneca also suggests that the deity is not limited to a man-made temple. "The whole world is the temple of the gods," he writes, "and indeed the only one worthy of their majesty and grandeur."[189] In a similar vein Euripides asks, "What house built by craftsmen could endure the form divine within enfolding walls?"[190] And Clement of Alexandria writes of Zeno:

> Zeno, the founder of the Stoic sect, says in this book of the Republic, "that we ought to make neither temples nor images, for that no work is worthy of the gods." And he was not afraid to write in these very words: "There will be no need to build temples. For a temple is not worth much, and ought not to be regarded as holy. For nothing is worth much, and holy, which is the work of builders and craftsmen."[191]

Finally, there is sprinkled throughout Greek literature the thought that God is not served by human hands as though He needed anything. Plato teaches that piety is certainly a service to the gods, but it must not be supposed that it in any way benefits them or makes them better.[192] On the contrary, as he elsewhere writes, the deity "is able of itself because of its excellence to company with itself and needing none other beside. Sufficing unto itself as acquaintance and friend."[193] Euripides says it quite succinctly: "For God hath need, if God indeed he be, of naught."[194] Other writers echo the same thought: "God alone is perfectly free from wants";[195] "the gods have need of nothing";[196] it is "the privilege of the gods to need nothing";[197] and, the deity exists, "needing us not at all."[198] Seneca is most adament that God needs nothing, but rather gives everything:

> But let us forbid lamps to be lighted on the Sabbath, since the gods do not need light, neither do men take pleasure in soot. Let us forbid men to offer morning salutation and to throng the doors of temples; mortal ambitions are attracted by such ceremonies, but God is worshipped by those who truly know Him. Let us forbid bringing towels and flesh-scrapers to Jupiter, and proffering mirrors to Juno; for God seeks no servants. Of course not; he himself does service to

> mankind, everywhere and to all He is at hand to help.[199]

Evidently many shared the attitude which Aristodemus expressed to Socrates: "Really, Socrates, I don't despise the godhead. But I think it too great to need my service."[200]

Thus, many echoes of Greek thought can be heard throughout Paul's first major point.

The same frequency of allusion can be seen in the development of Paul's second declaration, that God is the Creator of man whom He made in His Own image. The subordinate points of this second declaration--the seasons and times, the groping for God, His nearness to men--all have their reflections in classical writings.

Reference has already been made to Aratus' belief that the seasons demonstrate the goodness and power of God. Other writers have similar thoughts. Plato, in one of his dialogues, notes the witness of creation to the existence of God:

> CLIN (IAS OF CRETE). Surely it seems easy, Stranger, to assert with truth that gods exist?
>
> ATH (ENIAN STRANGER). How so?
>
> CLIN. First, there is the evidence of the earth, the sun, the stars, and all the universe, and the beautiful ordering of the seasons, marked out by years and months.[201]

Cicero also argues at length that the orderly processes of nature should inspire one to contemplate God:

> Just as when we see first the beauty and the

> brightness of the sky, then the amazing speed, which our thought cannot grasp, of its revolution, next the succession of day and night and the changes of the seasons divided into four to suit the ripening of the fruits of the earth and the constitution of living bodies, and the sun their ruler and guide, and the moon marking as it were and indicating the days in the calendar by the waxing and waning of her light; . . . and man himself formed as it were to observe the heavens and cultivate the soil, and lastly all fields and seas made subject to the service of man--when then we behold all these things and countless others, can we doubt that some being is over them, or some author, if these things have had beginning, as Plato holds, or if they have always existed, as Aristotle thinks, some governor of so stupendous a work of construction?[202]

Dio Chrysostom likewise thinks it incredible that men could be ignorant of the deity in view of his provision for them through nature:

> How, then, could they have remained ignorant and conceived no inkling of him who had sowed and planted and was now preserving and nourishing them, when on every side they were filled with the divine nature through both sight and hearing, and in fact through every sense? They dwelt upon the earth, they beheld the light of heaven, they had nourishment in abundance, for god, their ancestor, had lavishly provided and prepared it to their hand.[203]

But even with such an effective witness, the ancients admit that they are groping for God. The philosophers, says Plato, "are groping in the dark" with their speculations about the origin of matter and man.[204] He himself confesses "To discover the Maker and Father of this Universe were a task indeed; and having discovered Him, to declare Him unto all men were a thing impossible."[205]

And yet, in spite of their uncertainty, they still sense that God is not far away. Seneca exclaims, "God is near you; he is with you; he is within you."[206] Dio

Chrysostom writes that the conception of deity is innately present in every rational being:

> (There is) an idea regarding him and a conception of him common to the whole human race, to the Greeks and to the barbarians alike, a conception that is inevitable and innate in every creature endowed with reason, arising in the course of nature without the aid of human teacher and free from the deceit of any expounding priest.[207]

It is a conception, he goes on to say, which renders manifest God's kinship with man.[208] Epictetus urges a man to "subscribe heart and soul, as he ought, to this doctrine, that we are all primarily begotten of God, and that God is the father of men as well as of gods."[209]

All of these strains of thought are alluded to in Paul's second point. And so far, all of these allusions are quite comfortable to Paul's listeners. There would be a certain pleasure in being reminded of phrases in their own literature which refer to the divinely ordained seasons of nature, the groping of men, the nearness of God, and the kinship of God with men. The audience would probably feel flattered at this reflection of their tenets in the speaker's message. However, when Paul concludes his second point with the deduction,

> Since we, therefore, are God's offspring, we ought not to think the Godhead is like unto gold or silver, or stone, graven by art and men's device,[210]

the allusions become perhaps embarrassing: embarrassing because though the Greek writers might echo Paul's assertions, they do not echo his application. They do not take the next natural step and renounce the practice of idolatry.

The philosophical literature of ancient Athens simply could not see the inevitable implications of its own insights. It is true that Horace could write with derision in one of his satires--

> Once I was a fig-wood stem, a worthless log, when the carpenter, doubtful whether to make a stool or a Priapus, chose that I be a god. A god, then, I became, of thieves and birds the special terror.[211]

(A wooden statue of Priapus, the garden-god, was used as a scarecrow.)

--However, almost uniformly, Greek philosophy, at this point of worshipping idols, was filled with inconsistencies and contradictions. Seneca, one of the leading voices of Stoicism, almost seems to break away when he urges his followers:

> Only rise
> "And mould thyself to kinship with thy God."
> This moulding will not be done in gold or silver;
> an image that is to be in the likeness of God
> cannot be fashioned of such materials.[212]

(His quote is from Virgil's Aeneid). But unfortunately, his very next words are, "Remember that the gods, when they were kind to men, were moulded in clay."[213] In other words, clay is the proper material for an idol, not gold or silver.

This same inability to deny idolatry while recognizing God as Creator is reflected in the writings of Dio Chrysostom. In that very same discourse in which he recognizes the provision of God in nature and the conception of God in man,[214] he goes on to condone the making of graven images:

> For certainly no one would maintain that it had been better that no statue or picture of gods should have been exhibited among men, on the ground that we should look only at the heavens. For although the intelligent man does indeed reverence all those objects, believing them to be blessed gods that he sees from a great distance, yet on account of our belief in the divine all men have a strong yearning to honour and worship the deity from close at hand, approaching and laying hold of him with persuasion by offering and sacrifice and crowning him with garlands.[215]

Chrysostom goes on to compare men with infant children who, when torn away from father or mother, are filled with terrible longing and desire, and stretch out their hands to their absent parents, often in their dreams. So men do to the gods, rightly loving them for their beneficence and kinship, and longing to be with them and to converse with them. Consequently, he says, "many of the barbarians, because they lack artistic means and find difficulty in employing them, name mountains gods, and unhewn trees, too, and unshapen stones, things which are by no means whatever more appropriate in shape than is the human form."[216]

Even the ancients recognized this contradiction between creed and practice. Plutarch, for instance, rebukes the Stoics for their inconsistency and lack of adherence to their founder's teaching, reminding them that it is a doctrine of Zeno's that temples are not to be built to the gods, since the work of carpenters and craftsmen cannot be holy or valuable. Yet those who praise the words of Zeno, as wise and well-said, are initiated in the sacred mysteries, go up to the Citadel where Minerva's temple stands,

> adore the shrines, and adorn with garlands the sacaries, being the works of carpenters and mechanical persons. Again, they think that the Epicureans, who sacrifice to the Gods and yet deny them to meddle with the government of the world, do thereby refute themselves; whereas they themselves are more contrary to themselves, sacrificing on altars and in temples which they affirm ought not to stand nor to have been built.[217]

It is because of this philosophical inconsistency that idolatry can be so rampant in Athens. It should be noted here that real faith in the Greek gods waned; especially among the learned of Athens, but the Athenians were reluctant to give them up, for they attracted many visitors.[218] The paradox of their own literature is that it flashes with the insights of divine truth, yet resists the rational and spiritual worship of the living God. Through his allusions Paul brings this paradox into focus and attempts to lead his listeners into a step that their own writers have as yet not taken. He wants them to do what the philosophers have been unwilling to do--to renounce idolatry in light of the knowledge of God as Creator.

Paul chooses all of these allusions, therefore, both those that are flattering and those that could be embarrassing, to win his hearers to his message, and thus to his God. By picking those poetic quotations and philosophical echoes that an educated Greek would know, he leads his listeners through and beyond the insights of Athenian religion and into the full knowledge of the one true God. If this postulate that there is "one God" is accepted, his next thought is easily granted, that God has need of nothing. In making these allusions it should be clear that Paul is not commending Athenian philosophy to Athenian philosophers. He is not approving the pagan systems of belief which surround these allusions in context. The Old Testament is the source and authority for all the ideas in the structure of the speech, as a glance at the margin of the Nestle text will reveal. For example, see Isaiah 66:1, 2:

> Thus saith the LORD, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest?
>
> For all those things hath mine hand made, and all those things have been, saith the LORD; but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word.

In alluding to Greek philosophy, then, Paul is merely taking advantage of those heathen insights which are consistent with divine revelation. While acknowledging that the "gods" and "deities" of Greek religion are certainly not equivalent to the God he is proclaiming, he could still allow consistently and fully that pagan men, in spite of themselves and contrary to the controlling disposition of their minds, as creatures of God confronted with divine revelation, are capable of responses which are valid as long as, and to the extent that, these stand in isolation from pagan systems. Thus, thoughts which in their pagan contexts are quite un-Christian and anti-Christian can be acknowledged as up to a point involving an actual apprehension of revealed truth. As creatures of God, in spite of their sin and ignorance of God, the heathen are not without a certain awareness of Him and of their creaturehood. The truth is that because of men's ignorance and hostility to the truth, their awareness of God cannot give direction to their thoughts and life, or serve as a principle of interpretation of the world around them. But Paul recognizes that the pagan poets, while suppressing and perverting the truth, presuppose a measure of it. Thus, though the Apostle sees his task as basically proclaiming One of Whom the Athenians are ignorant, he can appeal even to the writings of pagans as pointing to the true relation between the sovereign Creator and His creatures.[219] Paul's goal is that men might understand, believe, and repent. The whole speech is evidence of the Apostle's ability to persuade by appealing to reason, and to use unique methods and proofs and a plan of arrangement particularly accommodated to the audience situation.

Paul appears to argue his case with the classical concept of inventio in view. The point of dispute in his sermon is that men should renounce idolatry in light of the knowledge of the one true God, Creator of the universe and men. On this issue his whole case turns. The issue emerges out of the development of his ideas, the lines of argument, the teaching situation. As Cicero asserted, "to teach is a necessity,"[220] and Augustine echoes the declaration with "Persuasion is not a necessity because it need not always be applied if the listener consents through teaching. . . . delight is not a necessity either. . . . the matter itself is pleasing when it is revealed simply because it is true."[221] Thus, Paul recognized that "the thing discussed does not need verbal ornaments, nor motions of the affections to persuade, but evidence as proof."[222]

Throughout the rhetorical situation Paul reveals knowledge of the various strands of thinking within his audience, and hence uses literature and philosophy in his line of argument. He employs Cicero's topic of *cause and effect*, arguing that *because* God is Creator of the universe He does not need a temple in which to dwell, and *because* men are made in His image they ought not to think that He is like gold, silver, or stone graven by man's device, and, therefore, they ought not to worship graven images. Finally, *because* the time is past when God will wink at such ignorance, and *because* God has appointed a righteous Judge, they must now repent. Cause and effect are incorporated into a systematic, progressive, climactic logic. Paul also uses the Ciceronian topic of *Consistency*,[223] arguing that the worship of idols is not consistent with the teachings of Greek poets and philosophers, or with his listeners' adherence to these teachings.

The structure of Paul's speech is also consistent with the *dispositio* of classical rhetoric, for he follows the traditional division found in *De Oratore*: ". . . the minds of the audience should be conciliated: ("I perceive that you are very religious," vs. 22): "next, our case should be stated:" (Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you," vs. 23); then "the point in controversy should be established:"[224] ("God that made the world and all things therein . . . dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men's hands . . . He hath made of one blood all nations of men . . . that they should seek the Lord . . . for we are also His offspring . . . Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold or silver . . . and now God commandeth all men everywhere to repent because He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained."[225]

In Paul's careful logic of deductive reasoning, in his understanding of the Greek poetry and philosophical literature, he fulfills Cicero's standards that "the orator will have the sublety of the logician, the thoughts of the philosopher, and the memory of a lawyer."[226]

Paul also appears to follow the "partes orationis" (parts of a speech), which Cicero outlines in De Inventione, and which also are given in the Ad Herennium:[227] exordium or opening, narratio or statement of facts, divisio or statement of the point at issue, confirmatio or exposition of arguments, confutatio or refutation of one's opponent's arguments, and conclusio or peroration. First the Apostle gives an exordium, conciliatory in nature, the object of which is to make his listeners attentive, ready to learn, and well-disposed: "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too religious."[228] Then he presents his narratio: "I passed by and beheld your devotions" (or "objects of worship") and "I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD."[229] According to Cicero and the author of Ad Herennium, the loci or "places" in which an orator could find arguments for making the audience well-disposed were to be found in the speaker's character, that of his opponent, in that of the audience, and in the actual facts of the case.[230] Paul's arguments are mainly founded on facts of the case. He distributes the rest of these facts throughout his confirmatio, as the author of Ad Herennium and Cicero allowed.[231] According to Cicero, "When to use narratio and when not is a matter for the orator's discretion."[232] The Roman orator stated that there were two kinds of dispositio, that according to the rules for the parts of speech given under inventio, and that where the orator used his judgment to vary the order.[233] That is, the orator could divide his speech into the order which the nature of his message dictated--a combination of the textbook order of the "partes orationis," and that produced by the orator's judgment, the latter being confined to the arrangement of arguments."[234] Paul's divisio or partitio is his statement of the point of issue, of what he proposes to prove. Classical rhetoric suggested that one of the ways in which a speaker could secure attention from his audience was to claim that he was about to speak of matters important, new, and unprecedented.[235] This is exactly what Paul does, saying, "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you."[236]

The confirmatio follows, an exposition of arguments employing, in this case, quotations and allusions. This part of a speech was treated elaborately by rhetoricians, for it appealed to the logical interests of the Greeks and lent itself to analysis. It is at this point in his speech that Paul gives his usual presentation of doctrine prior to exhortation. His is a closely knit pattern of argument wherein every section articulates with the preceding and the following. He has a clear conception of his task and selects and arranges his ideas in such a way as to make them effective.[237] This was the purpose of the dispositio of a speech. Paul's statements of fact are not scientifically demonstrated truth, but persuasive argument--that with which classical rhetoric concerned itself. Using the third mode of persuasion suggested by Aristotle, the Apostle seeks to "demonstrate the truth" he proclaims. Yet he seems mindful of the precept laid down by the author of the Ad Herennium that "we should not linger too long on the same topic, nor return again and again to the same point, nor leave an argument incomplete, nor move on to another in a clumsy fashion."[238] Paul's confutatio is a refutation of those who "think that the Godhead is like unto gold or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device."[239] His conclusio is an exhortation to repentance and a warning of judgment to come, both of which are suitably brief.

According to Hollinworth there are five steps in the technique of influencing an audience. Paul seems to have accomplished all of them: (1) Securing attention; (2) Establishing interest; (3) Making an impression; (4) Convincing the audience (some of them); (5) Directing the audience (to repent).[240]

Again, in this speech Paul reveals "recognition of the problem which is about to disturb the status quo:" (He is about to introduce the one, true God.) He sees the "bearing of the problem on the social setting," which is full of idols, and displays "fertility of mind" in seeking a solution, by proving that the idols are no gods, and the true God is not worshipped in the Athenian way. He shows "acuteness in argument through reasoning the implication of his suggestion" that the Athenians renounce idolatry and repent, the implication being that they will then be in right relationship to God on the day of judgment. The "verification" of Paul's judgment will follow the acceptance of his logic, through openness to further teaching about the Man Who was resurrected, and through the witness of God's Spirit to those who repent.[241]

In summary, in the structure and arrangement of his speech at Athens Paul appears to follow formal rules of composition. In his message can be traced the "perfect" argument of the Ad Herennium and the "partes orationis" as given in the Ad Herennium and in Cicero's De Inventione.[242] He fulfills the functions of the orator (officia oratoris) in his inventio--devising true matter to make a plausible case,[243] and in his dispositio or arrangement, as described in De Oratore. This arrangement is one of logic--of deductive reasoning, and his purpose is that of classical rhetoric which was to give effectiveness to truth as the speaker saw it. Paul considers the motives, prejudices, traditions, knowledge, and philosophy of his listeners, and applies his understanding of these to the practical task of instructing, pleasing, and winning them, in accordance with Cicero's three aims of rhetoric.[244]

Analysis of Style and Delivery

It will be remembered that the four virtues of style--propriety, correctness, perspicuity, and ornateness--all appear in De Oratore and apply to both the choice of words and their arrangement. Quintilian also discusses them, for they were considered the chief attributes and "musts" of style from the time of Theophrastus.[245]

"Propriety" has been defined as having to do with appropriateness of style and arrangement, while "correctness" refers to the purity of the language, the correct form of a word. As has been seen, by the very structure of his sermon, in its dispositio, Paul exemplifies the precepts of classical rhetoric and therefore, for the Greeks, of propriety. Furthermore, as Robertson notes, there is "a curious Attic flavor to the address of Paul here at Athens which every Greek student appreciates." This "flavor" includes correct Greek vocabulary and grammar. "Paul seems to respond to his atmosphere in his very language."[246]

Reference has already been made to the familiar and appropriate quotations and allusions, and to the straightforward style in general. A further point should be noted in regard to the straightforward style. Paul's avoidance of Asiatic bombast was not only appropriate to the substance of his message and to the region of Achaia, it was also in keeping with Stoicism's views on rhetoric. Seneca develops these views in one of his epistles:

> Even if I were arguing a point, I should not stamp my foot, or toss my arms about, or raise my voice . . . content to have conveyed my feelings to you without having either embellished them or lowered their dignity.
>
> I prefer, however, that . . . matters so important should not be meagre and dry; for even philosophy does not renounce the company of cleverness. One should not, however, bestow very much attention upon mere words . . . let us say what we feel, and feel what we say; let speech harmonize with life. . . . Our words should not aim to please, but to help. If, however, you can attain eloquence without painstaking, and if you either are naturally gifted or can gain eloquence at slight cost, make the most of it and apply it to the noblest uses. But let it be of such a kind that it displays facts rather than itself.[247]

Paul's adaptation to his audience's views on rhetoric is one further indication of the complete propriety of his message.

Besides these major adaptations there are other stylistic features which reveal Paul's intent to speak in a manner appropriate to Athens. Lake and Cadbury cite the following as interesting evidences of the more secular style of this speech:

> (a) The use of the neuters ο . . . τοῦτο si vera lectio (23) and τὸ θεῖου (29, v. l. in 27);
> (b) The use of γέ or infrequent compound particles of γέ (27 bis);
> (c) The paronomasia ζωὴν καὶ πνοήν (25);
> (d) The frequent alliteration;
> (e) The accumulation of forms or derivatives of πᾶς often in connexion with alliteration;
> (f) The repetition of the particle ὑπάρχων (24, 27, 29);
> (g) The idiomatic phrase πίυτιν παρέχω which is not Pauline πίστις.[248]

To these could be added the frequent triadic expressions found in verses 25, 28, and 29,[249] the paronomasia of πάντας πανταχοῦ found in verse 30,[250] and the classical "comparative of politeness" in δεισιδαιμονεστέρους in verse 22.[251]

Certain of Paul's word choices deserve special mention, for they show a deliberate preference for a Greek idiom over the customary Semitic expression. These are κόσμος in verse 24, θεισν in verse 29, ἀνήρ in verse 31, and πίστις in verse 31.

At the beginning of his first major point, Paul declares that God "made the world." Concerning this statement and the use of the Greek word "world," Dibelius writes:

> The affirmation of God as Creator belongs to the Old Testament; but it is hellenistic, rather than Old Testament usage, when the first phrase includes the

> word "world," whereas the Old Testament would speak of heaven and earth.[252]

Schubert agrees that this is a stylistic choice on Paul's part, stating, "τὸν κόσμον is a deliberate adaptation of τὸν οὔρανὸν καί τὴν γὴν to Greek terminology."[253]

The use of θεῖον in verse 29 to refer to God is another instance of picking a word familiar to his audience. Not otherwise found in either the Septuagint or the New Testament, it is intentionally and appropriately used in this situation since Paul is concerned to deal with philosophers who would, and "often did, object to the anthropomorphism of the Jewish religion."[254] The term was, of course, frequently used by the Greeks themselves.[255]

In verse 31 Paul speaks of "a man" whom God has appointed to judge the earth. Obviously this is the "Son of man" of Daniel 7:13, Matthew 24:27, and John 5:27, who receives authority to execute judgment from the Ancient of Days. But this latter Semitic idiom would have been meaningless to the Apostle's Athenian audience. Hence, he expresses the same sense in plain Greek.

Finally, in verse 31, Paul uses πίστις in the sense of "assurance" or "evidence," and not with its customary meaning of "faith." Such usage is once again otherwise foreign to the New Testament, but familiar in the language of classical literature.[256]

Thus, throughout Paul's sermon there are woven those stylistic features which are uniquely appropriate to an educated Greek audience. The choice of words, the use of classical syntax, the inclusion of quotations and allusions, the selection of a straightforward style--all of these are deliberately designed to please the Athenian ear and to reach the Athenian heart.

Besides propriety, Paul exemplifies correctness as well, for his message is given in the correct word forms and sentence construction of Koine Greek. Rather than use classical Greek, he chose to use the simpler vernacular form which was the "common dialect, the correct one for a speaker who aspired after intelligibility in preference to classic purity." The Greek words Paul employs are those which were readily understood by even the children of his day. Paul also exemplifies correctness of style in that his speech is brief and not verbose or superfluous. This is correctness in the Ciceronian sense, also.

The Apostle exemplifies perspicuity in a number of ways: (1) thorough knowledge and understanding of ideas, (2) discerning vocabulary, (3) simplicity of grammar, and (4) direct discourse.

1. Thorough knowledge and understanding of ideas: It will be remembered that Cicero defines style as the result of amplification based upon thorough knowledge. That the orator should be master of a universal knowledge is indeed the theme of De Oratore. No one can achieve eloquence and wisdom without study and knowledge, the Roman orator

declares,[257] for words and matter are interdependent.[258] The orator must investigate the whole content of the life of mankind.[259] Quintilian explains that the speaker must "devote care to words, but even more to matter; beauty of style is best when it comes naturally (as an outgrowth of matter), and is not deliberately sought after."[260] Thonssen and Baird offer the following concept and criteria of style:

> Style becomes the instrumentality through which ideas are made meaningful: it clothes the reason and emotion of the speaker in such words as will have intelligibility value for the hearers. . . . An effective style. . . . depends upon a speaker's having (1) an idea worth presenting, (2) an unmistakably clear conception of the idea, (3) a desire to communicate it, (4) a willingness to adapt it to a particular set of circumstances, and (5) a mastery of language adequate to express the idea in words.[261]

At Athens Paul displays a worthy idea, and a thorough knowledge and understanding of that idea. He desires to communicate it and is willing to adapt it to the circumstances of the audience situation. He also has a mastery of Greek vocabulary and grammar adequate to express the idea in words. He reveals knowledge of the philosophical tradition and literature of the Greeks, and of their own pride in their religiosity. He makes himself clear by stimulating the minds of his audience as they listen to their own writers describe God. By quoting Greek poetry and philosophy the Apostle shows a recognition of the contributions made by pagan wisdom to the cause of truth. Paul believes that his Gospel can be represented and understood in terms of Greek philosophy. The constant ideas of the Greek tradition which align themselves with Christianity reassure of the universality of Christian truth. Using the international culture as its basis, Christianity can become the new culture that has as "its source the divine Logos itself, the Word That . . . created the world."[262] Paul believes he has a thorough knowledge and understanding of the true concept of the nature of God, and the attitude of God toward idolatry. He also believes that his ideas are not only worthwhile but are necessary for salvation and therefore need urgently to be communicated. He further reveals a knowledge of his audience and of the rules regarding the place wherein he speaks. He knows that the Greeks always welcome the support of reason, and that reason alone should be the basis for a message given in the Areopagus. (This last point will be expanded upon in a later section.)

All of this is not to say that there is no stamp of individualism on Paul's speech at Athens, or on his other speeches. Even individualism is in line with the concepts of classical rhetoric. Cicero believed that professors who trained students to become orators should develop each pupil as an individual--his wisdom and goodness--at the same time that the student learned to read, write, memorize, and gain universal knowledge. Yet Paul's thorough knowledge of the great truths regarding the omnipresence and immanence of the One God is greater than the beauty of his own individual style, which is, as Cicero and Quintilian suggest, an outgrowth of the matter. It is Paul's thorough knowledge which makes it easy for him to communicate these ideas. As Saint Augustine testified:

> There is a kind of eloquence . . . which is becoming for men eminently worthy of the highest authority and manifestly inspired by God. . . . this eloquence is appropriate for them, and the more humble it seems to be, the higher it rises above others, not because of its conceit, but because of its solidity.[263]

2. Discerning vocabulary: Paul uses a vocabulary that clearly pictures what is and what has been so that his audience can see it. He chooses words familiar to them. As Quintilian says, "The best words are the obvious and natural ones, and those which are most closely connected with the matter."[264] Quintilian's prescription for composition is to know the theory of rhetoric, to read widely and so acquire a good vocabulary, to apply arrangement, and to practice.[265] Though philosophically astute, and a man of considerable education, Paul did not employ a learned or holy language, but rather followed in the tradition of the founders of Christianity who used the idioms of the people. Yet neither was Paul's sermon filled with trite cliches or meaningless verbage. His words were selective: he quotes correctly and commands a large treasury of Greek idiomatic phrases and vocabulary. As has been noted, perhaps the most singularly decisive indicant that Paul attempted to match his words to his audience is the large number of words that occur here which are unique to this passage in the New Testament. For example, the following are some uniquely or rarely used

words: "examining," 17:23; "objects of worship," 17:23; "altar," 17:23; "UNKNOWN," 17:23; "He needed anything," 17:25; "boundaries," 17:26; "an image graven," 17:29; "art," 17:29; and "winked at," or "overlooked," 17:30. There is a noticeable dearth of the use of technical language of Theology of any kind. Paul's meaning is adequately and clearly expressed because he speaks in common, unscientific, familiar words. As Saint Augustine stresses, a speaker cannot be effective if he is not understood.

It has been said that the variety of adjectives a man has at his command is the test of his culture. The Apostle Paul would come out well in this test because his adjectives are not only many but non-repetitious. His nouns and phrases used in a qualifying or descriptive sense are added one to another in cumulative effect; to remove any of them would injure or dilute his meaning, and make it less clear.

3. Simplicity of grammar: Paul exemplifies simplicity of grammar in that his sentences are easily understood. They are composed to excite attention and direct it to the most essential points. Though most of his sentences are grammatically complex, they gratify the image-making faculty of the mind, contributing to perspicuity. Paul uses all the subtleties and clarity of Greek phrases and Greek logical argumentation, as evidenced by his great variety of particles, rich participle constructions, and significant variation of prepositions, all of which help convey his thought.

Some of his phrases and sentences, such as "winked at" and "He is not far from us" have combined simplicity and interest enough to stand the test of time and "become the commonplaces of all subsequent literature."[266] Paul has "the style of genius, if not the genius of style."[267] The Apostle also makes himself clear by using the idiom of ordinary speech: brief statements that are not encumbered and oppressed by a multiplicity of words. He utters profound truths with dignified simplicity, his style being responsive to the purpose for which his speech is given, and avoiding monotony. "Sometimes there are flowing and sonorous passages; at other times simple and dignified statement."[268] Compare: "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things"--with--"Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you." Saint Paul is "master of his instrument,"[269] including its grammar.

4. Direct discourse: The sense of direct discourse evident in Paul's speech comes, for one thing, from the fact that he does not diminish the force of what he is saying with too much ornateness. He speaks in the Attic style, emphatically, and with the language of the heart, a chief characteristic of his intense individualism. "His life is ever in his hand, his heart is on his lips."[270] "How this

language of the heart must have rung into the souls of men accustomed to the silly volubility of the sophists."[271] Outside of the inspiration of God, the Apostle's sincerity is the power of his message. Paul intensely believes in the truth and importance of the message he expounds. He has "an overpowering impulse of loyalty to Christ and love for every child of God for whom Christ died, a passionate longing to save men from their doom and with them to welcome the returning Lord."[272] As a consequence his oration is essentially heart speaking to heart. He appeals to the Athenians' consciences by showing them that what they have been blindly seeking religiously and philosophically has at last been made clear by the revelation of God. He warns them that they must conform their lives to this teaching before the coming of judgment of all men. He uses eleven second-person pronouns as compared to four first-person pronouns. Eighteen third-person pronouns chiefly refer to God. Pertinent and coherent, Paul has his eye always on the point he is driving home, thus producing close argument that is unexcelled. "Certainly no more expert and splendid dialectical energy than that of Paul is known to have wrought in even the abundant and delicate Greek tongue."[273] In an age that increasingly cared for form rather than substance, delighting in exhibition and virtuosity, the direct, face-to-face, earnest, urgent style of the Apostle is significant and sharply delineated. Further, in his Phaedrus Plato insists that "a real art of speaking . . . which does not seize hold of the truth, does not exist and never will."[274]

The most noticeable characteristic of force is in the number of Paul's words--brevity. If it is true, and it is, that the more briefly a thing is expressed, Energy is the greater, than indeed the oratory of Saint Paul is forceful and direct. "As when the rays of the sun are collected into the focus of a burning glass, the smaller the spot is which receives them, compared with the surface of the glass, the greater is the splendor, so, in exhibiting our sentiments by speech, the narrower the compass of words is, wherein the thought is comprised, the more energetic is the expression."[275] Paul's elegance never conflicts with energy, for his sermons are very direct. The subject in hand is dealt with completely, the purpose accomplished, and the speech closed without superfluous words. All of this contributes to perspicuity.

Paul uses Ornamentation, the fourth Ciceronian virtue of style, but he employs it as a minor quality, ever held subsidiary to clearness and correctness. He makes no attempt to cover thought with high-sounding epithets and mock sublimity of language, or with tawdry magnificence, as the second sophistic did. His words and figures are judiciously chosen and conducive to Energy and persuasion. The boldest, most striking and poetical terms of expression are reserved, in this case, for the argument. Often it is the fineness and beauty of his ideas that form the exquisiteness of his language.

Paul, like Plato, seems to know the subtle but powerful role poetry plays in moving the minds of men. Thus, he follows Cicero's suggestion that the orator should quote poetry, but that he should use philosophy, too, because eloquence without wisdom is folly. The poetry Paul quotes does, certainly, enhance his message. One reason for this fact is that it supports his argument; a second reason is that power and beauty of words depend for their effect partly on rhythm and structure, which is found in poetry. In classical times rhythm was considered a valuable element in good speaking, and without it ideas and beauties of diction were thought to lose much of their effect. As we have noted, "There is no thought," Cicero says, "which can help the orator unless it is expressed aptly and with finish."[276] The words must be carefully arranged, with an ear for the good effect of rhythm. Cicero appeals to a number of Greek authorities and to the sensitive ear which expects and delights in harmonious rhythms, saying that the appeal to the ear is as important as the appeal to the head and the heart.[277]

However, Augustine points out the danger of distracting from the weight of divine statements by the addition of beautiful rhythms: "A studied leaning towards clearness at times neglects the more elegant expressions, and has no concern for what sounds well, but for what tells and explains well what one aims to point out."[278] Paul is not thinking chiefly of creating a beautiful style; he is concerned with communicating powerful truth. He completely subordinates eloquence of expression to the purpose of expressing his exact thought. Yet actually he wields a style of remarkable finish, rhythm, and eloquence without diminishing his natural intensity. In this sermon there is some use of ornament, but its power depends primarily on the sublimity of the thoughts expressed. Paul's style is always strong and vigorous, and his intelligence and depth of feeling give his language amazing beauty and power.[279] Unlike his fellow Apostles, however, Paul definitely uses rhetorical devices.

To Cicero, it will be remembered, style was the result of amplification, and to expand one had to know everything. "No man can be an orator complete in all points of merit who has not attained a knowledge of all important subjects and arts."[280] True rhetoric, according to Plato in the Gorgias, is based on knowledge. As has been noted, Paul expands and adds support for his speech with his knowledge of Greek poetry and philosophy. Without philosophy, Cicero declared, the ideal orator could not separate truth from falsehood.[281] The Apostle's speech is rational and related to the audience, unlike the ornate irrelevance and irrationality of the second sophistic.

However, to speak in a full, rich, and ornate style was perfectly compatible with Attic purity and faultlessness. These qualities were present in Demosthenes, and the man who took him as a model, according to Cicero, would be not only a good Atticist, but also, more importantly, a good orator.[282]

The first judgment known to us concerning Paul's ornamentation is contained in the work of Irenaeus, *On the Pauline Inversions*, where the ground for them is pronounced to be the rapidity of Paul's speech and the vehemence of his spirit.[283] Examples of *inversion* are found in the Athenian speech: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at"; and "in Him we live. . . ."[284] Paul uses the ornamentation of *example* and *illustration* through his *allusions* to Greek poetry and philosophy. With the Greek language, a whole world of material for illustration entered Christian thought. Paul also employs an eloquent and pleasing rhythm, aided by repetition of certain sounds: "H*e* n*ee*deth, s*ee*ing. . . ." "h*a*th *a*ppointed h*a*bitation." . . . and by alliteration: "*f*eel a*f*ter, *f*ind not *f*ar. . . . ," and balance of clauses and phrases:

> God that made the world and all things
> seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth
> dwelleth not in temples made with hands
> neither is worshipped with men's hands
> and hath made
> and hath determined
>
> the times before appointed
> the bounds of their habitation

they should seek the Lord,
they should feel after him,

in him we live
    and move
    and have our being

because he hath appointed a day,
in the which he will judge the world
by that man whom he hath ordained.

The entire speech is ornamented with an intensity of expression, revelatory of ardour and power; there is a progression from the moment of suspense which comes with "Him declare I unto you" through the lofty description of the Godhead, and the conclusion renunciating idolatry, to the climax of eloquence achieved through the grand style of warning, exhortation, and a final stirring declaration: "He hath raised Him from the dead!" Paul's total thesis is not in until his last word is spoken, an attribute of the classical ideal orator.

Concerning his delivery, Paul begins with the plain style of courtesy and propriety: "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you." This is the subdued style, useful for a review of Paul's thoughts and activities and for his declaration that he is about to teach his audience something new.

The main part of the Apostle's speech is in the eloquent rhythm of the moderate style, Paul's rhythmical variety and earnestness bearing the stamp of his individualism. As the plain style was used to instruct, the moderate style was used to please. Paul was not unaware that he spoke before keen and knowledgeable heirs of classical rhetoric.

The Apostle's parting warning and declaration is in the grand style of vehement persuasion, this style being used to win. Thus Paul concludes a speech begun in the plain style, and expanded in the moderate style, with the conceptions and fervor of the grand style. He opens calmly and "gains fire and momentum as he goes."[285] Versatility enables him to use all three classical styles of delivery which, according to Cicero, will be used by the effective orator.[286]

Cicero discusses versatility, the use of the three styles of delivery, in his Orator. This discussion is believed to have probably been based on the writing of Theophrastus, just as the four virtues of style were. The ideal orator Cicero asserts, should be master of all three styles and should use them to instruct, to please, and to persuade.[287] Lysias excelled in the plain style as an Attic orator, but Cicero was master of all three.[288] The Roman orator stated that the perfect speaker should be able to speak of ordinary things simply, great things magnificently, and middle things in the middle way.[289] Paul did this, demonstrating propriety and good taste,[290] and thus revealing himself to be an astute and effective orator.

Analysis of Pathos and Ethos

Are there evidences of Pathos and Ethos in Paul's sermon at Athens? The final areas of adaptation to be considered are Paul's choices regarding the emotional tone of his message and the conveying of a favorable impression of his own character. "Pathetic proof includes all those materials and devices calculated to put the audience in a frame of mind suitable for the reception of the speaker's ideas."[291] This definition would seem to include not only appeals to emotions but to motives. As Paul stands to preach against the idolatry of Athens, he takes care to express throughout his message a spirit of knowledgeable appreciation, concern, and a desire to be helpful, all of which should open the minds and hearts of his listeners. He also appeals to the Athenians' pride and satisfaction in their religiosity, intelligence, and culture, and to their curiosity about the new thing he preaches. Further, he appeals to their religious zeal which has not overlooked even "The Unknown God," and to their desire for preservation from evil, which that idol also symbolizes--evil that includes any judgment to come. It is most unlikely that Paul ever consciously formed any substantial part of his message as an appeal to just one aspect of the human personality. He aims at the whole man.

Many speech teachers today stress the interrelationship of the various aspects of invention.

> A separate treatment of reasoning and motivation need not mean that these categories are mutually

> exclusive. The old reason-emotion dichotomy is psychologically unsound. In other words, thoughtful and emotional reactions are interrelated and occur in varying proportions in different situations. If one supports the assertion that firearms must be handled in a certain way by showing how persons may be injured or killed, he is using an appeal which is at once logical and psychological. It is clear that all behavior has its motives; therefore, an advocate who stimulates certain desires and associates them with his proposition is not necessarily using illogical thinking.[292]

The most striking feature of Paul's introduction is its noticeable lack of polemic and invective. His spirit has been provoked by the city's abounding idolatry.[293] "Provoked" in Greek is the word from which our English "paroxysm" is derived. Paul, therefore, has a "sudden, violent emotional reaction" to what he has seen. He is probably angered, appalled, and saddened by the degree to which superstition has pervaded this center of Greek culture. Yet he does not begin by deploring the views of his audience or denouncing their images. As Glasser writes:

> Paul saw no point in blasting the worship of idols, exposing to ridicule its foolishness, and scolding the Athenians for their stupidity. Why give needless offense through assaulting head-on the radical errors of idolatry? Paul wanted to win men, not fight them.[294]

The Apostle begins, therefore, by appreciating that which can be honestly commended. (He uses this same approach in the introductions to his addresses before Felix and Agrippa.)[295] He acknowledges that in every way the Athenians are very religious. The impulse to adore is strong in them. They have a devotion and a longing for the spiritual realities of life. He knows that this is so, not because of what he has heard of them, but by his own first-hand observation of their religious objects. His words are an implied compliment, suggesting that he has made a careful, systematic inspection of their works, has studied their glories, and therefore speaks knowledgeably of their zeal for religion.

Not only does Paul speak approvingly of their religious enthusiasm, but also his initial reference to their idolatry is of the mildest sort possible. He does not immediately denounce their images as base and senseless. Instead, he employs an unusual and almost respectful word to describe what he has seen--σεβάσματα, "objects of worship." He acknowledges the plethora of their statuary as evidence of their deep-seated desire to worship something. And it is this same spirit of worship that he would cultivate and channel in his sermon. Paul's choice of σεβάσματα creates the proper mood not only because it reveals a warmth on his part but also because it is appropriate to the very ground on which they are standing. The hill of the Areopagus was holy ground to the Athenians. In the great speech in Aeschylus' _Emenides_, 680-715, in which Athena tells how the Court which met there came to be instituted, the word σέβας or σέβειν is repeated four times in 35 lines and recurs again thereafter.

This feeling of knowledgeable appreciation continues throughout the sermon as Paul quotes Greek poets and alludes to Greek philosophers. These references reveal both his knowledge of classical literature, as has been noted, and his appreciation for the measure of truth contained therein.

At the same time that he is maintaining a warm mood of acceptance, Paul is still concerned that the Athenians turn from the error of their ways. He does not want them to go away lost, however good they might feel. So while he commends their reverential spirit, he nevertheless attempts to show its misdirection. He wants to be helpful because he feels a genuine emotion of concern for them.

This desire to be helpful appears early in the sermon. Paul's whole reason for speaking is that he might instruct his audience concerning the God they worship but do not know. He would satisfy the ignorance and longing which they themselves have confessed in their altar to the Unknown God.

The concern of the Apostle is evident throughout the oration. The very fact that he is willing to proclaim what may be an unpopular and ridiculous message should show his hearers that he cares about them. The full force of this concern appears in the conclusion where he pleads with his listeners to repent in view of the coming judgment. The burden of his heart is that they might be saved, for he is filled with the constraining love of Christ. It is his awareness of the coming judgment, of the nature and love of the true God, and the ignorance of his audience that compel him to speak. Here his own motives are laid bare.

However, "the pathetic is a note which sounds stronger in Roman than in Greek oratory."[296] Quintilian observed that "the judge overcome by his emotions abandons all attempt to discover the truth."[297] The Greeks laid greater weight on the strength of arguments offered to their understanding and reason. Stoicism was the predominant philosophy of the Hellenistic world, and the Stoic dialectic urged brevity, simplicity, and the eschewing of all emotional appeals. Paul, apparently knowing this, appeals almost entirely to the logic and rationality of his Athenian audience. Probably he also has in mind the Greek rules concerning speeches made before the Court of the Areopagus. The judges of this court held their sittings at night, so that nothing would distract their minds from the business on which they had to decide, and so that the sight of the accused might not affect them either with pity or aversion. In reference to this, "all pleaders were strictly forbidden to use any means whatever to excite either pity or aversion, or to affect the passions; everything being confined to simple relation or statement of facts."[298] This stress on factual reality and truth is the essence of Paul's address.

Nevertheless, beneath the forms of Paul's theosophic reasonings and their hints of deep philosophy, there are heard the strains of concern and urgency, and appeals to the Athenians' emotions. The impressions of idolatry rest heavily on the Apostle's sensitive nature, and color the flow of his thoughts and expressions. Because of his experience of, and belief in, the one true God, his mouth speaks out of the fullness of his heart. With an ardent and enthusiastic eloquence he gives vent to the feelings which have been excited within him, his reaction to what he has seen.

Thus, though his speech is brief, Paul is able to approach the Athenian intelligentsia from both the emotional aspect of their religious beliefs and the mental aspect of their highly sophisticated and intelligent culture, while presenting himself as a sincere man of good will, seeking to bring them relevant knowledge. As an orator he must have seemed to many to be a "good man speaking well."[299]

It is impossible to dissociate a speech from the orator himself, since what he says, how he says it, and what he is, are all an inseparable part of the message. Paul, in his speaking, immediately displays the classical elements of virtue, competence, and goodwill, which Cicero required of the perfect orator.

Concerning virtue, Paul's arguments fulfill the six canons of Thonssen and Baird who have pointed out that:

> In general a speaker focuses attention upon the probity of his character if he (1) associates either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated; (2) bestows, with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause; (3) links the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous; (4) removes or minimizes unfavorable impressions of himself or his cause previously established by his opponent; (5) relies upon authority derived from his personal experience; and (6) creates the impression of

being completely sincere in his undertaking.[300]

Paul is certain that he ministers life to all who believe his message, and judgment to those who disbelieve. No doubt this conviction shines through his voice and his countenance. He associates himself with what is virtuous by linking himself and his message to the Source of all life and benevolence, revealing himself to be devout and authoritative because he is familiar with the personal characteristics of the true God and His work. The Apostle "bestows, with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause" by demonstrating that he is pure in intent, by describing the greatness and benevolence of the One God in lofty terms of reverence and praise, and by presenting his cause as one of real concern for his listeners' spiritual well-being. He links his opponent--in this case, idolatry and those who do not understand his message--with what is not virtuous, by proving that idolatry is inconsistent with basic doctrines held by Athenian philosophers and their followers, and that it is unintelligent and insulting to the nature of man. He "removes or minimizes unfavorable impressions of himself or his cause previously established" by declaring that he has *not* come to declare foreign deities, in defiance of Athenian law, but to present the Unknown God Whom his listeners already worship. The Apostle "relies upon authority derived from his personal experience" of God, of the nature of man, of the Scriptures and of the philosophy and literature of Greece. He "creates the impression of being completely sincere in his undertaking" by his own earnest delivery, and by the fact that he is supported by Greek writers already revered by his listeners. He further asserts that the truths he speaks have been evidenced by nature, by an inward witness given to all men, by rationality, and by a resurrection from the dead.

References to the Godhead are in every paragraph of Paul's message with the exception of his opening sentences. Thus, he links his arguments with Divinity. He speaks "under a compelling power as great as that felt by the prophets--a compelling power to which he surrenders himself willingly and to the uttermost."[301] This conviction of the virtuous worth of his message is the first secret of Paul's convincing oratory, and it carries with it as a corollary a sense of his personal responsibility and virtue. No rhetorical training is necessary to recognize his ardour.

Under Aristotle's discussion of ethical proof he suggested that a second feature inspiring belief is "sagacity." This virtue is discussed by Cicero, also. Another definition of the term is "intelligence" or "competence."

The authoritative note throughout Paul's discourse is the corollary of the competence he displays in argument. Steir exclaims, "What an unsurpassable mingling of the wisdom of the serpent and the harmlessness of the dove; of prudent caution and of bold advance, of quiet forbearance and culting exposure, of the most exact controversy and the most impartial statement!"[302] Paul is equipped to win the aristocratic intelligentsia as well as the uneducated and lowly.

According to Thonssen and Baird, with certain variations depending upon circumstances, it may be said that an orator helps establish an impression of competence if he (1) "uses what is popularly called common sense; (2) acts with tact and moderation; (3) displays a sense of good taste; (4) reveals a broad familiarity with the interests of the day; and (5) shows through the way in which he handles speech materials that he is possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom."[303]

With reference to these canons concerning "competence," does Paul manifest common sense? Perhaps the best way the Apostle exemplifies this virtue is by what he does not say. That is, he does not commence by haranguing the Athenians for their idolatry. He does not begin with a sentence about the main problem agitating him. Common sense tells him that such an opening will cost him his audience. He also uses common sense in that, in accordance with Cicero's precept in De Oratore, he gratifies the anticipation of the audience as quickly as possible.[304]

Second, Paul displays "tact and moderation" by not adding another God to the Athenian's panorama of idols by initially preaching Jesus. He tactfully demonstrates empathy with their religious zeal, and intelligent appreciation of their poets and philosophers. In fact, by referring to the poets and philosophers, he enhances his own character and probably arouses some emotions. Further, he manifests moderation by speaking with a moderate teaching spirit. His delivery is chiefly in the rhythmical moderate style greatly appreciated by Greek lovers of beauty. He evinces tactfulness, also, by inferring confidence in his audience, that they will be glad to hear and receive information regarding their Unknown God.

The third criterion of competence suggested by Thonssen and Baird is the possession of good taste. Paul manifests this quality by the delicacy of appeal throughout his discourse. He works ethos in reverse, building up the character of the audience so that they will try to react to his message according to the good reputation of religious zeal which he has attributed to them. Furthermore, he practices good taste in appealing to their own admired poets and philosophers rather than bringing in the Jewish Scriptures for his support. He does not administer hard blows of recrimination.

The Apostle demonstrates a "broad familiarity with the interests of the day" if we interpret this expression to mean whatever things held most interest for his listeners. With these things Paul shows comfortable familiarity, behaving himself as befitting to a speaker in the Areopagus, and discussing the revered philosophers and poets with whom members of his audience are also familiar, alluding to the doctrines which they themselves hold, and to the kind of worship in which they indulge. Paul also reveals intimate knowledge of the ways of God and the significance of the resurrection. Thus, his competence is indicated in matters of eternal interest as well as in everyday affairs.

Finally, we would ask in this discussion of Paul's competence, "Does he show by the way in which he handles speech materials that he is possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom?" Probably the section describing the development of ideas offers the best answer to the present question. The intelligence of the Apostle is suggested by the manner in which he chooses to accomplish his purpose of persuasion. Adapting his materials to his audience, Paul skillfully chooses to motivate by well-chosen examples and religious appeals, and by close and extended argument. He chooses major arguments easily supported from the experience of the Athenians, revealing integrity by employing honest, deductive reasoning from premises they already accept in the writings and teachings of their poets and philosophers. Further, he applies his message to fulfill his declared purpose for his speech.

The Apostle begins with an authoritative touch that reveals integrity and wisdom: "What you don't know, I will declare to you." Long before the time of Paul, Isocrates, the great teacher, had stressed that all the lessons in the principles of oratory could not compare to assurance.[305] A study of the contrast between the internal psychological pressures Paul must have experienced, and the external calm that he displayed in his well-reasoned presentation would be of great interest to psychologists. He appears self-confident and convinced that his message is worth hearing, and speaks as if he understands his audience sufficiently to bring practical counsel and strong admonition.

It has been said that "the listener's attitude toward the speaker is unquestionably a factor of great importance in speech. . . . Whatever causes the audience to form an opinion of the speaker cannot be a matter of indifference to the speaker unless he is indifferent to the outcome of the speech."[306] Paul is anything but indifferent, and by apparently practicing the precepts of Cicero in his _exordium_, he overcomes the initial difficulties. He also appears to follow Cicero's standards for an orator in the remainder of his address, exemplifying wisdom by being thoroughly familiar with his theme, seeking to interest, inform, and convince, and choosing arguments to achieve his desired purpose.

The third constituent of ethical proof is evidence of the _goodwill_ of the speaker. The Christian counterpart of the Aristotelian and Ciceronian "goodwill" is evidenced in the Apostle's loving concern and desire to be helpful. Thonssen and Baird suggest that:

> A speaker's good will generally is revealed through his ability (1) to capture the proper balance

> between too much and too little praise of his audience; (2) to identify himself properly with the hearers and their problems; (3) to proceed with candor and straightforwardness; (4) to offer necessary rebukes with tact and consideration; (5) to offset any personal reasons he may have for giving the speech; and (6) to reveal, without guile or exhibitionism, his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth.[307]

At the beginning of his message, Paul gives his audience just the *right balance of praise* for their religious zeal, and later praises them indirectly by revealing agreement with the poets their culture also recognizes.

The Apostle *identifies himself with his audience and their problems* by announcing that he will helpfully declare to them the Unknown God they worship but confess they do not know. Paul very clearly discerns that his message will be disturbing to the "status quo" and so analyzes the nature and bearing of the message upon this particular social setting. He speaks realistically and in harmony with the experience of those whom he addresses. This is true identification or empathy.

In the *Ad Herennium* exhortation is given that good delivery ensures that what the orator says seems to come from the heart. By communicating a spirit of empathy or identification Paul creates this favorable atmosphere, thus facilitating the acceptance of his message.

The Apostle's last warning involves the notion of fear, but it springs from the logic of reasoned argument which has preceded it. Out of the facts implied by his logic comes an emotion which he himself shares *for* his audience and *with* them, as part of his own clear convictions. Logos and pathos intertwine; logos is Paul's chief concern, but his message contains emotional and ethical overtones empathetically in line with the needs, characteristics, and demands of his Athenian listeners.

Saint Paul proceeds with candor and straightforwardness, describing the One true God and quoting the Athenians' own philosophers and poets as support for his reasoning. At the conclusion of his message he continues to speak openly and directly, not dodging the issue of a physical resurrection. Then, with tact and consideration, he rebukes his hearers, saying that in the light of that inner knowledge of God given to all men, and the testimony of Nature, together with the writings of their own philosophers, and the reasonings of their own intelligence, they ought to know better than to worship graven images. He tactfully saves his strongest rebuke for the close, not the beginning, of his message.

Paul offsets personal reasons for giving the speech by revealing that his own activities and his speech itself are generated by one and the same motive: an unselfish concern for his audience. This concern is declared in his initial proclamation--he will explain to them what they, for their best interests, ought to know. He then reveals, without guile or exhibitionism, his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth. These qualities include a knowledgeable appreciation of his listeners and their culture, a concern and desire to help them, competence in expounding the doctrines of their own poets and philosophers, and virtue as an ambassador of the One true God. Paul's power of projecting his personality to the audience and evidencing sympathetic comprehension of their ideals and aims distinguishes him as an empathetic orator whose efforts at communication are unexcelled.

The Apostle projects himself into not only the local situation, but also into the feelings of mankind in general. In the Orator, Cicero gives this advice:

> Whenever he can, the orator will divert the controversy from particular persons and circumstances to universal abstract questions, for he can debate a genus on wider grounds than a species. Whatever is proved of the whole is of necessity proved of the part. A question thus transferred from specific persons and circumstances to a discussion of a universal genus is called a thesis.[308]

Cicero then enlarges on the thesis as a legitimate literary form that can include among other things, discussions on the nature of the gods.[309] Paul follows this precept in his sermon at Athens. He takes the one small idol which has been designated as the Unknown God consigned to a particular place, and diverts what could have become a controversy regarding the particular worship of this single idol, to the explosive, abstract proof of one exclusive, universal, creating, all-pervasive Spirit--God, in whose image man is made, and Who cannot be worshipped by men's hands, thus proving the worship of all idols to be vain. By discussing the nature of God, Paul touches not only on the universal inner knowledge of man that God is indeed "not far from every one of us," but on man's intuitive desire to seek after and find Him. Thus, comprehending concepts vitally related to the life of everyone, the Apostle vocalizes the heartbeat of man.

Paul's unique ethos produces his unique style. Zeal, power, faith, love, humility, and genius characterize his life and therefore his style, and are projected in his language of the heart.

Summary

Paul's sermon to the Gentiles in Acts 17 represents a decisive encounter which confirmed that Christianity had a universal message, and that Gentiles as well as Jews would receive the new faith.

The sermon takes place in the idolatrous city of Athens before a mixed and curious audience. The rhetorical situation and Paul's own deep convictions constrain him to speak. He chooses the Greek philosophical tradition as a common basis from which to give his diatribe, and designs every aspect of his message for this particular audience. Paul criticizes idolatry only with arguments that have been commonplace in philosophical Greek thought since the sixth century B.C., displaying an approach to philosophical ideas which is otherwise not found in the New Testament. He does not quote from the Old Testament as he did at Antioch, or advance doctrines that are distinctly Jewish, but rather he lays down the fundamental principles of natural theology. His message is centered around knowledge of the true, omnipotent and immanent God, Creator of the universe and of men; and the Apostle reasons from this to a repudiation of Athenian temples, sacrifices, and graven images. He supports his ideas with poetic quotation, a common practice among Greek rhetoricians, and with philosophical allusions familiar to his educated audience. He announces that God's forbearance with the Athenians' ignorance is drawing to a close and, therefore, they should repent in preparation for coming judgment by the Man Whom God has raised from the dead. The response to his sermon is a mixture of ridicule, procrastination, and doubt, but a few believe.

In Paul's message can be traced the "perfect" five-fold argument of the Ad Herennium. He also seems to have used the five speech processes Cicero considered necessary in preparing any oration, and appears to argue with the classical concept of inventio in view. His whole case turns on the point of dispute; the issue emerges out of the development of his ideas, out of the lines of argument, and he employs Cicero's topics of Cause and Effect and Consistency.

The Apostle's dispositio is a closely knit pattern of argument wherein every section articulates with the preceding and following. He is in line with the Ad Herennium's precept that one should not linger too long on the same topic, return to it repeatedly, leave it incomplete, or move on to another clumsily. He uses largely Stoic arguments calculated to convince educated minds, and the deductive method of reasoning which is the Stoics' own. He appeals chiefly to the Athenians' logic, for they most respect arguments offered to their reason, and the Stoic dialectic urges not only brevity and simplicity, but the eschewing of all emotional appeals. In his reasoning, understanding of the Greek philosophical mind, and memory of Greek poetry and philosophy, Paul fulfills Cicero's standards that the orator will have the logician's subtlety, philosopher's thoughts, and lawyer's memory. Paul also adapts to the place wherein he speaks, since Athenian rules concerning speeches made at the Areopagus forbid pleaders to affect the passions of their hearers.

The "partes orationis" as given in the *Ad Herennium* and in Cicero's *De Inventione* can also be found in Paul's speech. In his *exordium* he uses the classic rhetorical claim of presenting important new matter to secure his audience's attention. He also imitates the opening salutation common with Attic orators, and occuring constantly in the speeches of Demosthenes--an imitation apparently both knowledgeable and deliberate.

Paul's *elocutio* is uniquely appropriate to his audience, as seen in his use of classical syntax, his inclusion of Greek quotes and allusions, his selection of a straightforward Attic style, his use of the dialect and idiom appropriate to cultured Greeks, and his choice of vocabulary which includes many words unique to this speech alone. The four virtues of Style praised in De Oratore also appear in Paul's address. The rich, ornate style of Demosthenes was considered compatible with Attic purity and faultlessness, and Paul embellishes with inversion, illustration, allusion, assonance, alliteration, and rhythmical balance. He also uses suspense, progression, and climax. Paul's total thesis is not in until his last powerful word is spoken, an attribute of the classic ideal orator.

Versatility enables the Apostle to use all three classical styles of delivery. Paul begins his deliberative address with the plain style of courtesy and propriety, and concludes it with the grand style of vehement persuasion; but his speech is chiefly in the eloquent, pleasing rhythm of the moderate style, prepared for an audience who loved beauty combined with reason in rhetoric.

Paul appeals to the Athenians' curiosity, religious zeal, desire for self-preservation, and pride in their religion, intelligence, and culture. He considers their motives, prejudices, knowledge, and philosophy, and applies his understanding of these to the task of instructing, pleasing, and winning them, in accordance with Cicero's three aims of rhetoric. Throughout his sermon he communicates an attitude of knowledgeable appreciation as well as a concern to be spiritually helpful.

Zeal, dialectical energy, faith, love, humility, and genius characterize Paul's life and style. Classical rhetoric allows for his intense individualism, because Cicero, who relies more on psychology, knowledge, and experience than on rules, decrees that the individuality of young orators should be trained and developed, as a means of enhancing their speaking.

Thus, though his speech is brief, the Apostle is able to approach the Athenian intelligentsia from both the emotional aspect of their religious beliefs and the mental aspect of their highly sophisticated, intelligent culture, while presenting himself as a sincere man of virtue, competence, and goodwill--the classical elements of ethos. Longinus describes him as "the boast of all eloquence and Grecian genius":[310] Paul becomes everything to everyone in order to save some of them.

Ph.D.
Sp
'77
S915
v.2

FOOTNOTES

[1] T. Harwood Pattison, *The History of Christian Preaching* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1916), p. 89.

[2] Richard Belward Rackham, "The Acts of the Apostles; an Exposition," *Westminster Commentaries*, Walter Lock and D. C. Simpson, ed. (14th ed.; London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1951), p. 312.

[3] Werner Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 11.

[4] Albert J. Croft, "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 62 (October, 1956), 286, 287.

[5] Croft, p. 288.

[6] Croft, pp. 287, 288.

[7] Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, *Speech Criticism; the Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal* (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948), p. 9.

[8] Thomas R. Nilsen, "Interpretive Function of the Critic," *Western Speech*, 21 (Spring, 1957), 74.

[9] Acts 17:16.

[10] R. E. Wycherley, "St. Paul at Athens," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, 19 (October, 1958), 619-20.

[11] Ample enumerations and descriptions can be found in Pausanias *Description of Greece*, 1. 2-30, and in Oscar Broneer, "Athens: 'City of Idol Worship,'" *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 21 (February, 1958), 2-28.

[12] Livy, *From the Founding of the City*, trans. Alfred C. Schlesinger in Loeb Classical Library, ed. James Loeb (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951), 13. 65. 27.

[13] Albert Barnes, Notes on the New Testament (London: Blackie and Son, n.d.), III, p. 290.

[14] Walter Miller, Greece and the Greeks (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941), p. 173.

[15] Barnes, p. 290.

[16] Pausanias Description of Greeks, trans. W. H. S. Jones, Loeb Classical Library, ed. James Loeb (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), 1. 1. 17. 1; 22. 3.

[17] Cicero De Legibus, trans. Clinton Walter Keyes, Loeb Classical Library, ed. James Loeb (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951), 2. 2.

[18] Strabo, Geography, trans. Horace Leonard Jones, Loeb Classical Library, ed. James Loeb (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), 4. 9. 1. 16.

[19] Strabo, 9. 1. 16.

[20] Acts 17:16.

[21] Acts 17:17.

[22] James Stalker, The Life of St. Paul (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1912), p. 64.

[23] Acts 17:17.

[24] Giuseppe Ricciotti, Paul the Apostle, trans. Alba I. Zizzamia (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1952), pp. 316, 317.

[25] Ricciotti, p. 317.

[26] Acts 17:18.

[27] Olaf Moe, The Apostle Paul: His Life and His Work, trans. L. A. Vigness (Minneapolis: Augsbury Publishing House, 1900), p. 285; cf. Bertil Gartner, "The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation," trans. Carolyn Hannay King, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, ed. Anton Fridrichsen and Haral Riesenfeld (Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells, 1955), pp. 47, 48.

[28] Adolf Deissman, Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. William E. Wilson (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1926), p. 198.

[29] H. M. Mecklin, "Paul in Athens," The Bible Student, 7 (February, 1903), 81.

[30] Acts 17:18.

[31] Gartner, The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation, p. 48; cf. Randall T. Pittman, Words and Their Ways in the Greek New Testament (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1942), pp. 87-91.

[32] W. M. Ramsay, "St. Paul in Athens--II," The Expositor, 5th Series, 2 (1895), 220-22.

[33] Acts 17:18.

[34] Giuseppe Ricciotti, The Acts of the Apostles; Text and Commentary, trans. Laurence E. Ayrne (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1958), p. 270.

[35] Acts 17:19.

[36] Pausanias, 1. 28. 5.

[37] Marvin R. Vincent, Word Studies in the New Testament (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930), 3, p. 284.

[38] W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 289, 290.

[39] Acts 17:19, 20.

[40] Acts 17:21.

[41] Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, trans. Charles Forster Smith, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 3. 38.

[42] Demosthenes, First Philipic, trans. J. H. Vince in the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), p. 10; Answer to Philip's Letter, p. 17.

[43] C. H. Dodd, New Testament Studies (Manchester: The Manchester University Press, 1953), p. 69.

[44] The question as to whether Paul was brought to the Areopagus that he might be tried by the judges of that court is sometimes answered with a reference to one judge who was there. We are told that one effect of Paul's preaching was that he converted Dionysius the Areopagite (verse 34), and this seems to show that he, who was a judge of that court, was present, and if so, probably other judges were present

also. Thus, Paul could have been on trial for "setting forth strange gods," an act strictly forbidden in Athens, on threat of capital punishment.

Other reasons given to show that Paul was on trial are:

1. If they who brought Paul to Areopagus wanted only to satisfy their curiosity, they had opportunity to do that in the marketplace (verse 17). Why then did they take him to another place?

2. When it is said that they brought Paul to Areopagus, it is said that they took him, or rather laid hold on him, as the Greek word is translated in Luke 23:26, where Simon the Cyrenian is "laid hold of" to carry the cross of Jesus; and in Luke 20:20, 33, where spies in the audience tried to "lay hold of" the words of Jesus to condemn Him.

[45] Some have suggested a different understanding of the historical setting of this sermon. For a discussion of their views, see Appendix B.

[46] Emory S. Bogardus, Fundamentals of Social Psychology (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1931), p. 323.

[47] Acts 17:22-31.

[48] Werner Jaeger, Early Christianity and Greek Paideia, p. 5.

[49] S. Lieberman, Greek in Jewish Palestine (New York, 1942), and Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (New York, 1950), cited in Werner Jaeger, p. 108.

[50] Jaeger, p. 12.

[51] Jaeger, p. 11.

[52] Jaeger, p. 10.

[53] Acts 13:27, 28.

[54] Jaeger, p. 66.

[55] Albert Barnes, Notes on the New Testament (London: Blackie and Son, n.d.), III, p. 295.

[56] Joseph Addison Alexander, Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, Classic Commentary Library (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1956), p. 613.

[57] Frederic Henry Chase, The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1902), pp. 212, 213; Edwin Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1889), pp. 43-45; Eberhard Nestle, "Contributions and Comments: Acts xvii. 22," The Expository Times, 11 (1899-1900), 378; and "Notes of Recent Exposition," The Expository Times, 18 (August, 1907), 485-87.

[58] Werner Foerster, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. II: A-H, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), p. 20. Gartner, "The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation," Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, p. 238; Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, English Translation and Commentary, The Beginnings of Christianity; Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1920-1933), IV, pp. 214, 215; W. Armin Moellering, "Deisidaimonia, a Footnote to Acts 17:22," Concordia Theological Monthly, 34 (August, 1963), 466-71; and N. B. Stonehouse, "The Areopagus Address," Paul Before the Areopagus and Other New Testament Studies (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), pp. 16, 17.

[59] Other writers of antiquity were similarly impressed. The common consent was that the Athenians were "the most pious of the Greeks," (Josephus Against Apion, ii. 130); "the most devoted in the worship of the gods" (Isocrates Panegyricus, 33); and "far more devoted to religion than other men" (Pausanias Description of Greece, 1. 24. 3). According to Plato, his fellow Athenians offered up to the Gods "more and finer sacrifices than any of the Greeks, and have adorned their temples with votive emblems as no other people have done, and presented to the gods the costliest and stateliest processions year by year, and spent more money thus than all the rest of the Greeks together" (Alcibiades, 2. 148). Cf. Sophocles Oedipus at Colonus, 260, and Pausanias Description of Greece, 1. 17. 1.

[60] For a discussion of the questions connected with this altar and its inscription, see Appendix C.

[61] Lucian, Philopatris, trans. M. D. Macleod, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 3. cap. 13. 769, and cap. 29. 180.

[62] W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.), 1, p. 376.

[63] Isocrates, Panegyricus, trans. George Nolan, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), I. 24. Cf. Isocates, Panathenaicus, trans. George Nolan, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), 2. 124; Aristophanes, The Wasps, trans. Benjamin Bickley Rogers, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 1. 1076; and Euripides, Ion, trans. Arthur S. Way, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946), 4. 29.

[64] Deuteronomy 32:8.

[65] Henry J. Cadbury, "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts: I," Journal of Biblical Literature, 44 (1925), 219-21; Gartner, "The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation," pp. 147-51; Lake and Cadbury, English Translation and Commentary, the Beginnings of Christianity; Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, 4. 216; and Richard Belward Rackham, "The Acts of the Apostles; and Exposition," Westminster Commentaries, ed. Walter Lock and D. C. Simpson (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1951), p. 316.

[66] F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of Acts; the English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes, The New International Commentary on the New Testament, ed. Neb B. Stonehouse (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), p. 358; and Martin Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, trans. Mary Line, ed. Heinrich Greeven (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1956), pp. 29, 30.

[67] W. Eltester, "Schopfungsoffenbarung und Naturliche Theologie im fruhen Christentum," New Testament Studies, 3 (1956-57), 93-114; and Hans Conzelmann, "The Address of Paul on the Areopagus," Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. Leander E. Keck and S. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 222, 223.

[68] Cf. Psalm 76:13-17; Jeremiah 31:35, 36; I Clement 20.

[69] Romans 1:20; Acts 14:17.

[70] Archibald Thomas Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament: The Acts of the Apostles (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930, 3. 288.

[71] Cf. Ephesians 4:17.

[72] Donald King, Religion in Greek Rhetoric (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1965), p. 371. Cf. Eric A. Havelock, Preface to Plato (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, n.d.), pp. 38-41.

[73] James A. Winans and H. H. Hudson, *A First Course in Public Speaking* (New York: The Century Company, 1925), p. 192.

[74] Acts 17:28.

[75] Acts 17:28, 29.

[76] Henry J. Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (New York: Harper & Brothers PUblishers, 1955), p. 69; cf. Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 50, 51.

[77] John 15:5.

[78] From *Synopsis Sohar*, cited by Adam Clarke, *The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, A Commentary and Critical Notes* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n.d.), I, p. 897.

[79] Gartner, "The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation," pp. 195-97; Alexander, *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, p. 619.

[80] For as many as received him, to them gave he the power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of man, but of God. John 1:12, 13.

For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. Galatians 3:26.

. . . the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; But is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage, under the elements of the world; But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.

Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ. Galatians 4:1-7.

Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God; and everyone that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him. I John 5:1.

[81] Acts 17:30, 31.

[82] Romans 3:25.

[83] Daniel 7:13 and John 5:7.

[84] John 5:22-29.

[85] Albert Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. William Montgomery (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1931), p. 37.

[86] H. H. Milman, The History of Christianity (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1841), 1. 450.

[87] I Corinthians 9:22. Cf. N. B. Stonehouse, The Areopagus Address (London: The Tyndale Press, 1949), p. 15.

[88] Acts 17:32-34.

[89] Aeschylus, Eumenides, trans. Herbert Weir Smyth, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 2. 647. 48.

[90] Lucian, The Passing of Peregrinus, trans. A. M. Harmon, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), 5. 13.

[91] Edmund P. Clowney [Eutychus], "Jesus and Anastasia," Christianity Today, March 27, 1961, p. 13.

[92] Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 72.

[93] Robert S. Kinsey, With Paul in Greece (Nashville: The Parthenon Press, 1957), p. 124.

[94] Lake and Cadbury, English Translation and Commentary, The Beginnings of Christianity; Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, 4. 220.

[95] Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History, trans. Kirsopp Lake, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 2. 3. 4. 11; cf. also 4. 23. 3.

[96] F. J. Foakes-Jackson, The Acts of the Apostles, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary, ed. James Moffatt (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1931), p. 167; and Maurice Jones, St. Paul the Orator; a Critical, Historical, and Explanatory Commentary on the Speeches of St. Paul (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910), p. 106.

[97] W. M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949), p. 252.

[98] David Smith, The Life and Letters of St. Paul (New York: Harper & Brothers, n.d.), p. 148. Cf. J. H. Maclean, "St. Paul at Athens," The Expository Times, 44 (September, 1933), 551.

[99] Note the different social classes of the Philippian converts in Acts 16:11-40.

[100] Acts 17:34.

[101] Sydney Cave, The Gospel of St. Paul; a Reinterpretation in the Light of the Religion of His Age and Modern Missionary Experience (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928), p. 115.

[102] Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, p. 252.

[103] I Corinthians 2:2.

[104] Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, p. 252.

[105] Ramsay, "St. Paul in Athens--II," p. 275.

[106] Rackham, p. 320. Cf. Smith, The Life and Letters of St. Paul, pp. 148, 149.

[107] I Corinthians 1:17.

[108] Paul Feine and Johannes Behm, Introduction to the New Testament, trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr., ed. Werner Georg Kummel (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 130.

[109] Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 79.

[110] Acts 18:3, 4.

[111] Lake and Cadbury, p. 224.

[112] Stonehouse, "The Areopagus Address," p. 36.

[113] I Corinthians 2:1-5.

[114] Charles Sears Baldwin, Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (to 1400), Interpreted from Representative Works (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1959), p. 5.

[115] Cicero, Orator, trans. H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 6. 20.

[116] Cicero, Orator, 23. 76. 79.

[117] Cicero, Orator, 23. 77; 24. 81.

[118] Cicero, Orator, 25. 86.

[119] Cicero, Orator, 26. 87.

[120] Cicero, Orator, 26. 91.

[121] Cicero, Orator, 26. 91.

[122] Cicero, Orator, 6. 21.

[123] Cicero, Orator, 28. 97.

[124] Cicero, Orator, 28. 97.

[125] Cicero, Orator, 5. 20.

[126] Cicero, Brutus, trans. G. L. Hendrickson, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 82. 284-85. 291; De Optimo Genere Oratorum, trans. H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), 3. 7-2. 10; Orator, 7. 23-9. 32. Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, trans. H. E. Butler, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 4. 12. 10. 12-26.

For an analysis of the Asiatic-Atticist dispute, consult M. L. Clarke, Rhetoric at Rome; A Historical Survey (London: Cohen & West Otd., 1953), pp. 80-83; G. M. A. Grube, The Greek and Roman Critics (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1965), pp. 122, 123, 181-184; George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 302, 303, 330-36; and Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism; The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948), pp. 40, 152-57, 187-90.

[127] Grube, The Greek and Roman Critics, p. 325.

[128] Baldwin, Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic, pp. 16, 17.

[129] Baldwin, p. 20.

[130] Baldwin, p. 39.

[131] I Corinthians 2:1-5.

[132] Eunapius, The Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists, trans. Wilmer Cave, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge:

Harvard University Press, 1952), p. 475.

[133] Plato, The Statesman; trans. Harold N. Fowler, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 3. 283C.

[134] Sydney Cave, The Gospel of St. Paul, p. 115.

[135] Wilbur Smith, Therefore Stand; A Plea for a Vigorous Apologetic in the Present Crisis of Evangelical Christianity (Chicago: Moody Press, 1945), pp. 259, 260.

[136] William Stuart McBirnie, The Search for the Twelve Apostles (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House, Publishers, 1973), pp. 36-38.

[137] W. Charles Redding, "Extrinsic and Intrinsic Criticism," Western Speech, 21 (Spring, 1957), 102.

[138] Redding, p. 102.

[139] Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism; The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal, p. 361.

[140] Stonehouse, "The Areopagus Address," p. 15.

[141] Percy Gardner, "The Speeches of St. Paul in Acts," Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day, ed. Henry Barclay Swete, Cambridge Biblical Essays (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1909), p. 399.

[142] Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, 4. 12. 10. 10-24.

[143] Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 56.

[144] J. Ritchie Smith, "The Speeches of Paul in Acts," The Bible Student, New Series, 7 (April, 1903), 202. Cf. Alfred Ernest Garvie, The Preachers of the Church (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1926), p. 56; H. B. Hackett, "The Discourse of Paul at Athens; A Commentary on Acts 17:16-34," Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Review, 7 (May, 1849), 346; and Jesse Burton Weatherspoon, Sent Forth to Preach, Studies in Apostolic Preaching (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), p. 118.

[145] Paul Robertson, Paul, The Interpreter of Christ (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1921), p. 159.

[146] J. W. McGarvey, New Commentary on Acts of Apostles (Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Foundation, n.d.), pp. 119, 120.

[147] Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, p. 57.

[148] Stonehouse, "The Areopagus Address," p. 38.

[149] Stonehouse, pp. 38-40. Cf. W. H. Mare, "Pauline Appeals to Historical Evidence," *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 11 (Summer, 1968), 128.

[150] Percy Gardner, "The Speeches of St. Paul in Acts," pp. 402, 403.

[151] Thonssen and Baird, *Speech Criticism; The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal*, p. 393.

[152] Cicero, *De Oratore*, trans. E. W. Sutton, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948), I. 167.

[153] Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 3. 6. 76; Cf. Cicero, *De Inventione*, trans. H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), 2. 78-86.

[154] Quintilian, 10. 4. 15.

[155] Titus 2:1.

[156] Ephesians 5:4.

[157] Cicero, *Oratory and Orators*, trans. J. W. Watson, (Philadelphia: David Makay, 1897), p. 49.

[158] Joseph Addison Alexander, *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, p. 613.

[159] James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrage, *The Art of Good Speech* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953), p. 210.

[160] Donald Leman Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), pp. 112, 113.

[161] McBurney and Wrage, *The Art of Good Speech*, p. 210.

[162] Virginia Holland, "Rhetorical Criticism: A Burkeian Method," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 39 (December, 1953), 444, 445.

[163] Donald C. Bryant, "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, December, 1953, p. 11.

[164] Albert Barnes, Notes on the New Testament (London: Blackie and Son, n.d.), 3. 294.

[165] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, trans. Harry Caplan (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), 1. 2; Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, 3. 4. 1 f.

[166] William Macpherson, The Psychology of Persuasion (New York: Methuen and Co., 1920), p. 171.

[167] Aristotle, The "Art" of Rhetoric, trans. John Henry Freese, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), 1. 3. 1-3.

[168] Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, 1. 9. 11. 12.

[169] Acts 17:27, 28.

[170] Aratus, Phaenomena, trans. G. R. Mair, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), pp. 186-98.

[171] Aratus, Phaenomena 1-15.

[172] Athanasius, The Incarnation of the Word of God, trans. Religious of C.S.M.U. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946), 7. 9.

[173] Saint Augustine, Confessions, trans. William Watts, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960-61), 7. 9.

[174] Isho'dad of Merv, Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, ed. and trans. Margaret Dunlop Gibson, Horae Semiticae, 10 (1913), quoted by Rendel Harris, "St. Paul and Epimenides," The Expositor, Eighth Series, 4 (October, 1912), 352. This same story about Minos and his panegyric is found in the Nestorian commentary known as the Gannat Busame, or Garden of Delights (J. Rendel Harris, "The Cretans Always Liars," The Expositor, Seventh Series, 2 (October, 1906), 309, 310.

[175] Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; American edition, ed. A. Cleveland Coxe (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), 1. 14. 59. See also 2. 1. 19.

[176] Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers, trans. R. D. Hicks, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 1. 112.

[177] Rendel Harris, "The Cretans Always Liars," p. 305.

[178] Aristotle, The "Art" of Rhetoric, 1. 15. 13.

[179] J. W. McGarvey, New Commentary on Acts of Apostles, pp. 120, 121.

[180] G. H. Gilbert, Greek Thought in the New Testament (New York: Macmillan Co., 1928), p. 54.

[181] Conybeare and Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, p. 313.

[182] Dero A. Saunders, ed., The Portable Gibbon: The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (New York: The Viking Press, 1957), pp. 273-76.

[183] Acts 26:1-24.

[184] Richard Belward Rackham, "The Acts of the Apostles; An Exposition," Westminster Commentaries, p. 312. Rackham's observation regarding the speech at Athens is probably one of the finest expositions of the subject.

[185] Strabo, Geography, 14. 5. 13.

[186] Demetrios J. Constantelos, "Vallilios X. Joannides on Paul and the Stoic Philosophers," Anglican Theological Review, 42 (January, 1960), 19.

[187] Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers, 7. 148.

[188] Seneca, Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales, trans. Richard M. Gummere, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 95. 48.

[189] Seneca, De Beneficiis, trans. John W. Basore, Moral Essays, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), 3. 7. 7. 3.

[190] Euripides, Fragment 968, cited in Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts, p. 357.

[191] Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, 5. 11. 77.

[192] Plato, Euthyprho, trans. Harold North Fowler, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), 1. 13 A-D.

[193] Plato, Timaeus, trans. R. G. Bury, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 7. 34B.

[194] Euripides, The Madness of Hercules, trans. Arthur S. Way, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 3. 1345, 46.

[195] Plutarch, "Aristides and Cato Major," Lives, trans. Bernadotte Perrin, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), 2. 4. 4.

[196] Lucian, The Cynic, trans. M. D. MacLeod, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 8, 12.

[197] Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers, 6. 104.

[198] Lucretius De Rerum Natura, trans. W. H. D. Rouse, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 2. 650.

[199] Seneca De Lucilium Epistulae Morales, 95. 48.

[200] Xenephone, Memorabilia, trans. E. C. Marchant, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 1. 4. 10.

[201] Plato, Laws, trans. R. G. Bury, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 10. 10. 886A. Cf. also his Philebus, trans. Harold N. Fowler, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 3. 26B; and his Symposium, trans. W. R. M. Lamb, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 5. 188A.

[202] Cicero Tusculan Disputations, trans. J. E. King, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 1. 28. 68-70.

[203] Dio Chrysostom, Discourses, trans. J. W. Cohoon, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 2. 12. 29.

[204] Plato Phaedo, trans. Harold North Fowler, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), 1. 99B.

[205] Plato Timaeus, 28C.

[206] Seneca Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales, 41. 1; cf. 120. 14.

[207] Dio Chrysostom, Discourses, 12:27.

[208] Dio Chrysostom, 12:27 and 30. 26.

[209] Epictetus Discourses, trans. W. A. Oldfather, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), 1. 1. 3. 1.

[210] Acts 17:29.

[211] Horace Satires, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), 1. 1. 1-5. A wooden statue of Priapus, the garden-god, was used as a scarecrow.

[212] Seneca Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales, 31. 11. His quote is from Virgil's Aeneid, 8. 364, 365.

[213] Seneca, 31. 11.

[214] Dio Chrysostom Discourses, 12. 27, 39.

[215] Dio Chrysostom, 12. 60.

[216] Dio Chrysostom, 12. 60, 61.

[217] Plutarch, "The Contradiction of the Stoics," Morals, trans. E. Smith, rev. William W. Goodwin (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1870), 4, 6.

[218] Walter Miller, Greece and the Greeks (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941), p. 165.

[219] Stonehouse, "The Areopagus Address," pp. 29, 30.

[220] Cicero De Oratore, 21. 69.

[221] St. Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1958), p. 137.

[222] St. Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, p. 154.

[223] Cicero De Partitione Oratoria, trans. H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948), 2. 7.

[224] Cicero De Oratore, 1. 31. 143.

[225] Acts 17:24-31.

[226] Cicero De Oratore, 1[illegible]89.

[227] *Ad Herennium*, 1. 4; Cicero *De Inventione*, 1. 19; cf. *De Oratore*, 1. 143.

[228] Acts 17:22.

[229] Acts 17:23.

[230] Cicero *De Inventione*, 1. 22; *Ad Herennium*, 1. 8.

[231] *Ad Herennium*, 1. 16; Cicero *De Inventione*, 1. 30; *De Oratore*, 2. 330.

[232] Cicero *De Inventione*, 1. 30.

[233] *Ad Herennium*, 3. 16; Cicero *De Oratore*, 2. 307.

[234] M. L. Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome* (London: Carter Lane, 1968-74), p. 171.

[235] *Ad Herennium*, 1. 6-8; Cicero *De Inventione*, 1. 22, 23; Cicero *De Partitione Oratoria*, 28-30; Quintilian, 4. 1. 5ff.

[236] Acts 17:23.

[237] See Thonssen and Baird, *Speech Criticism*, p. 393.

[238] *Ad Herennium*, 2. 27ff.

[239] Acts 17:29.

[240] Jon Eisenson, *The Psychology of Speech* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1938), pp. 204-206.

[242] A discussion of these five standards for a speaker can be found in Thonssen and Baird, *Speech Criticism*, p. 336. Paul relied, for the "verification" or confirmation of his words, upon such as he speaks of in Romans 8:16; II Thessalonians 2:13-16; I Corinthians 2:4; and as is spoken of in I John 3:24; 3:6; 5:6, 10-13; and John 6:63.

[243] *Ad Herennium*, 1. 4; Cicero *De Inventione*, 1. 19; cf. Cicero *De Oratore*, I. 143.

[244] *Ad Herennium*, 1. 3; Cicero *De Inventione*, 1. 9.

[245] Cicero *De Oratore*, 21. 69.

[246] Cicero *De Oratore*, 3. 37; Quintilian, 7. 1-11. 1.

[247] A. T. Robertson, *Epochs in the Life of St. Paul: A Study of Development in St. Paul's Career* (London: Hodder

and Stoughton, 1969), p. 160.

[247] Seneca Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales 75. 2-5.

[248] Lake and Cadbury, English Translation and Commentary, The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, 4, 209.

[249] W. C. Van Unnik, Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth, trans. George Ogg (London: The Epworth Press, 1962), pp. 19-27.

[250] Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 57.

[251] Henry J. Cadbury, "The Speeches in Acts," Additional Notes to the Commentary, ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, The Beginnings of Christianity; Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, v, 419, n.2.

[252] Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 41.

[253] Paul Schubert, "The Place of the Areopagus Speech in the Composition of Acts," Transitions in Biblical Scholarship, ed. J. Coert Rylarrsdam, Essays in Divinity, ed. Jerald C. Brauer (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 254.

[254] Wilfred L. Knox, The Acts of the Apostles (Cambridge: University Press, 1948), p. 71.

[255] W. H. Mare, "Pauline Appeals to Historical Evidence," Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society, 11 (Summer, 1968), 125.

[256] Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 57.

[257] Cicero De Oratore, p. 475.

[258] Cicero De Oratore, p. 17.

[259] Cicero De Oratore, pp. 31-43.

[260] Quintilian Institutio Oratoria, VIII. pr. 20, 8.

[261] Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 430.

[262] Werner Jaeger, Early Christianity and Greek Paideia, pp. 63, 64.

[263] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, pp. 175, 176.

[264] Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, VIII, pp. 24-26.

[265] Quintilian, VIII, pp. 28-30.

[266] F. J. Foakes-Jackson, The Life of St. Paul: The Man and the Apostle (London: Jonathan Cape, n.d.), p. 275.

[267] F. W. Farrar, The Life and Work of St. Paul (London: Cassell, Fetter, Galpin & Co., 1879, I, pp. 691, 692.

[268] Kathleen E. Innes, The Bible as Literature (London: J. Cape, 1930), p. 238.

[269] Innes, p. 238.

[270] F. W. Farrar, The Life and Work of St. Paul, p. 690.

[271] T. R. Glover, Paul of Tarsus (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1930), p. 194.

[272] Guy Lee and Carroll Mitchell, Orators of the Early and Medieval Church, Vol. 3 of The World's Orators, ed. Guy C. Lee, Joseph Ayer, Carroll Mitchell (New York: The Knickerbocker Press, 1901), p. 3.

[273] Storres, Divine Origin of Christianity, p. 225, cited by Howard Tillman Kuist, The Pedagogy of St. Paul (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1925), pp. 105, 106.

[274] Plato, Phaedrus, trans. Harold N. Fowler (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 517.

[275] Richard Whately, Elements of Rhetoric: Comprising an Analysis of the Laws of Moral Evidence and of Persuasion, with Rules for Argumentative Composition and Elocution (New York: Sheldon & Company, Publishers, 1869), p. 210.

[276] Cicero, Orator, 23. 5.

[277] Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, VIII, p. 22.

[278] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, VIII, p. 22.

[279] John E. Steinmuller, A Companion to Scripture Studies: Special Introduction to the New Testament (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., n.d.), p. 249.

[280] Cicero, Orator, IV, 14. 16.

[281] Cicero, Orator, IV, 16. 17.

[282] Cicero _De Optimo Genere Oratorum_, 7-13.

[283] A. Tholuck, _Remarks on the Life, Character and Style of the Apostle Paul_ (Edinburgh: Thomas Clark, 1840), p. 24.

[284] Acts 17:30 and 17:28.

[285] Quintilian _Institutio Oratoria_, 11. 3. 174.

[286] Cicero _Orator_, 100-103.

[287] Cicero _De Oratore_, I, 21. 69.

[288] Cicero _Orator_, 23, 103; _De Optimo Genere Oratorum_, 9, 10.

[289] Cicero _Orator_, 100-103.

[290] Cicero _Orator_, 80, 81.

[291] Thonssen and Baird, _Speech Criticism_, p. 358.

[292] Glen E. Mills, _Composing the Speech_ (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952), p. 193.

[293] Acts 17:16.

[294] Arthur F. Glasser, "The World Needs a Message," _Eternity_ (July, 1967), p. 13.

[295] Acts 24:10-21, and Acts 26:2-23.

[296] M. L. Clarke, _Rhetoric at Rome_, p. 47.

[297] Quintilian _Institutio Oratoria_, VI. 2. 4-6.

[298] Adam Clarke, _The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, A Commentary and Critical Notes_, I, 824, 5.

[299] Quintilian _Institutio Oratoria_, I. pr. 9; II. 14. k, 34; II. 16. 11, 31, 43; II. 20. 4; II. 21. 12.

[300] Thonssen and Baird, _Speech Criticism_, p. 386.

[301] Kathleen E. Innes, _The Bible as Literature_, pp. 223, 224.

[302] Rudolf Stier, _The Words of the Apostles_, trans. G. H. Venables (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1869), p. 303.

[303] Thonssen and Baird, _Speech Criticism_, p. 387.

EXTRA 100% RAG

[304] Cicero _De Oratore_, p. 437.

[305] Isocrates, _The Works of Isocrates: On the Peace; Areopagiticus; Against the Sophists; Antiodosis; Panathenaicus_, trans. George Nolan, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), II, p. 341.

[306] James H. McBurney and Earnest J. Wrage, _The Art of Good Speech_ (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953), p. 43.

[307] Thonssen and Baird, _Speech Criticism_, p. 387.

[308] Cicero _De Oratore_, XIV. 45, 46.

[309] Donald L. Clark, _Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education_, p. 132.

[310] Dionysius Longinus, cited in Tholuck, _Remarks on the Life, Character and Style of the Apostle Paul_, p. 39.

CHAPTER VI

THE RHETORIC OF HOSEA

Hosea must be seen as a citizen, as a patriot, as a religious zealot, as a husband, and as a father, before his true position and stature as a preaching prophet are evident. The turbulence and revolution within the national government has had its influence upon him. The religious fluctuations and decline have aroused his emotions. Social and moral decay have invaded his own home with resultant separation and sorrow. The private life of Hosea becomes an enduring and beautiful symbol, for his love as a husband and father, thwarted and betrayed by his own wife, forms a basis for understanding the betrayal of divine love by a favored people.

The name "Hosea" comes from the same Hebrew root as "Joshua" and "Jesus," meaning "salvation," or "deliverance." Hosea is the only prophet of northern Israel whose chief task is to preach to his own people. He is the home missionary of Israel while Jonah could be called their foreign missionary. All the other prophets, including Amos and Micah, are from Judah.

The experiences of Hosea comprise the main bases of his speeches. "Le style, c'est l'homme." His pedigree receives slight mention. He is said to be the son of Beeri, but as a prophet his genealogy does not count. He is the voice of God. The only indications of his nationality point to Israel.[1] He does not state his former occupation in any clear way, or attach importance to this past. He speaks of providing corn, new wine, oil, wool, and flax,[2] and he supplies gold and silver.[3] The fig tree, lily, olive trees, vines, and fir trees that he mentions in his speeches may indicate that he is an orchardman like Amos. But he is also familiar with a baker's schedule and problems,[4] and with the threshing floor and the wine press.[5]

Hosea records chiefly the sins and fate of Israel. His mission seems to be to announce her fall, with her subsequent repentance, and her ultimate return to Jehovah. As a native he seems to feel more for Israel than did Amos, so that deliverance after judgment is his emphasis, and hope is mingled with his denunciations. The historical setting of his speeches is of vital significance because the international threats, the national unrest and insecurity, and the religious revolt and decline from Jehovah worship to the pagan practices of Baal worship have created in the populace a reckless attitude of abandonment which challenges the prophet to his highest and most desperate endeavors in behalf of the cause of Jehovah. Because Hosea has loved and has lost the object of his affection, he sees and understands the heartbreak of Jehovah over His beloved Israel.

From the time of Abraham, Palestine or the land of Canaan was the promised land. God had a purpose in selecting the crossroads of the East and the West, the North and the South of the world. It is, therefore, not because God was provincial that Hosea spoke of Palestine as especially His land: as Chapter Nine, verse three reveals, God says of disobedient Israel, "they shall not dwell in Jehovah's land; but Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and they shall eat unclean food in Assyria."

The only preparation Hosea seems to gain for his prophetic speaking is derived from his marital life. He is faced with Jehovah's command to marry: "Go take unto thee a wife of whoredoms,"[6] the reason being "for the land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord."[7] Divine revelation centers in the first three chapters. Here, God not only tells him to go marry, but what to name each child, and later to go and buy back his adultress wife. Love, loneliness, rejection, and sorrow over a wayward wife and mother have served to enlarge Hosea's heart. Courage and purpose fills the impassioned orator: he must make Israel see the sin of her faithlessness to her betrothed husband and God.

The education of Hosea seems to consist of his study of history and his pondering of the social, religious, and political problems of the day. Political unrest, civil strife, and the threats of Assyria and Egypt move him strongly. He makes several historical references, and diagnoses the symptoms of his society's ills, bringing into focus the religious conflict between Jehovah and Baal worship. Like Paul, at Athens, he has the true God to declare to an idolatrous people. The sad part is that this God is not "unknown" to the children of Israel. They are simply indifferent to Him.

Theories Concerning Hosea and His Marriage

Any attempt to understand Hosea and his speeches involves the consideration of the theories regarding the prophet's relationship to his wife, Gomer, because Hosea constantly compares the unfaithfulness of Gomer to the infidelity of Israel to Jehovah.

Many scholars believe that Hosea is a prophet before his marriage, but they disagree about his relationship to Gomer. There are approximately six basic theories regarding this relationship, and many minor variations of them.[8]

One theory holds that the entire marriage is pure allegory, dramatic fiction fabricated by the prophet. However, it is difficult to believe that Hosea would want to tell such a story about his own wife and family if it were not true.

A second theory, held by a larger group, states that Gomer has tendencies toward whoredom, but that she does not become a harlot until after she has married Hosea. Some suggest that Hosea first is gone from home as an itinerant prophet for an extended time, and when he returns, he finds a baby expected that could not be his own, so that his travels contribute to Gomer's delinquency. Others suppose that while he is away she follows friends in idolatrous worship which leads her on into immorality. Most scholars who believe Gomer had a latent tendency toward becoming a profligate woman, also believe that it is while Hosea grieves over her infidelity that he discerns the lesson Jehovah has tried to teach him. This same unfaithfulness is Israel's attitude and action toward her lover, God. Such a theory seems natural, probable, and consistent with human experience, and of course, coincides with Israel's pattern of unfaithfulness. Many scholars such as Cheyne, A. B. Davidson, W. R. Harper, Kuenen, Marti, Nowack, W. Robertson Smith, G. A. Smith, and Welhausen all agree with this concept.

R. E. Wolfe,[9] and others, advocate a third theory that once Gomer leaves home she is stoned by an indignant mob of her own people. They believe that Hosea's account of his reclamation of her has been inserted by exilic editors of a later date, and that a distinct period exists in the preaching of Hosea following the death of Gomer. During this period, unpleasant memories are shoved aside as he relives his happy rural childhood. It is during this "reliving" that Hosea mentions the wild grapes, first-ripe figs, and a pet heifer,[10] and remembers the happy children learning to walk.[11] However, if Hosea actually gives up Gomer, allowing a mob to murder her, then his message of a long-suffering, loving, redeeming God is inconsistent with the experience God has ordained for him, and with what he has done.

Still another scholar, R. H. Pfeiffer, in his Introduction to the Old Testament, believes that Gomer is a pure woman when she marries Hosea, and remains so. The woman described in the third chapter of the book is not Gomer at all. Rather, she is a common slave whom Hosea buys and looks after as a symbol of Israel's impending slavery and God's unending love. This theory fails to account for Hosea's story of his own personal tragedy, and for the real heartbreak and passion in his preaching.

A fifth view holds that Hosea is commanded by God to marry a known prostitute, just as the record literally states.[12] According to J. M. P. Smith, "Hosea was not led blindfolded by Yahweh into a marriage that was to break his heart and wreck his life." Such an act would be contrary to the character of God. "On the contrary, he married a woman of evil reputation with his eyes wide open."[13] This concept does no violence to the record as given by Hosea.

Details of this theory have been imagined by some writers who describe Hosea's infatuation with a temple prostitute and the futile attempt to reform her with his love. An objection to this view is that since Jehovah loves and provides for Israel before the nation becomes wayward, the similarity to Israel's infidelity would be reduced. An objection to the objection is that the chosen people were always wayward, beginning even with Abraham whose doubt and self-will at one point brought into being a perpetual rival of the children of Isaac and Israel, God's chosen people. Man's heart has always been prone to leave his God, and God knew this when He set His heart upon an "impudent," "rebellious," and "stiff-necked" people.[14]

When J. F. McCurdy discusses the problem of the prophet's relationship with Gomer, he deals with its interpretation as literal or figurative. He states that if Hosea's marriage is figurative, it can be understood as an allegory, or an object lesson. However, due to the influence of Ewald (Die Propheten des alten Bundes, Gottingen, 1867), and W. R. Smith (The Prophets of Israel, Edinburgh, 1882), the literal view was held most in favor in McCurdy's time.[15] He further states:

> The defenders of the two leading views have in fact completely refuted one another, and it is one of the marvels of Biblical exegesis that a positive attitude is still maintained by eminent critics upon each side of the question.[16]

The Historical Setting

The introduction to Hosea's prophecy reads that he prophesied under the kings of Judah, Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, and under Jeroboam II, King of Israel. Hosea must have lived a long time to have prophesied in the reign of all these princes, for there are 112 years from the beginning of Uzziah's reign to the end of Hezekiah's reign. Uzziah began to reign A.M. 3194, and Hezekiah's reign ended in 3306. If Hosea were 20 or 25 years old when he began to preach, he would have lived to be 132, or 137. Adam Clarke states that "in the whole collection of Hosea's prophecies, we find nothing which proves that he prophesied so long."[17] Clarke questions why the prophecies should be dated in the title by the kings of Judah, when Hosea did not live under their dominion, and concludes that this title is not Hosea's, but some ancient transcriber's, so that the real beginning of the prophet's work begins with the words, "The beginning of the word of the Lord by Hosea." Thus, Hosea could have begun preaching at the end of Jeroboam's reign, who was Jeroboam II, king of Israel.[18] Many scholars believe that Hosea prophesies from the end of Jeroboam's reign to the inauguration of Hezekiah (784-722 B.C.) when Samaria falls. Judah is carried into captivity about 700 B.C.

Within the book of Hosea itself there are indications that his prophetic period includes the time between the death of Jeroboam II in 744 B.C., and the expedition of Tiglath-Pileser in 734 B.C. There is no allusion to this expedition. He pictures anarchy[19] and alliances with the heathen,[20] but he makes no mention of the Syro-Ephraimitic War in 734 B.C.

These dates would imply that Hosea is a contemporary of Isaiah and Amos, and indeed, his first chapters reveal the same period of prosperity before Jeroboam's death that Amos describes. However, most of Hosea's preaching reveals a declining prosperity, a suffering kingdom approaching its fall.

The Political Setting

The kingdom of Israel has been torn asunder by the crafty schemes of the grasping king who has been branded with the stigma, "Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin." The demands of the law have been relaxed. Peace and prosperity have fled the land as it is harassed by domestic strife and the fear of foreign invasion. By might and murder, the throne has been seized and kept, and in a futile attempt to guarantee security, national alliances have been formed with nations who entice Israel to follow pagan practices. The nation is thoroughly debased and reckless in behavior, and only a fraction of its population maintain spiritual allegiance to Jehovah.

After the death of Jeroboam II, there is an interim of ten years. At the end of this period, his son, Zechariah, assumes the throne and is slain by Shallum after only six months. Four weeks later, Shallum is assassinated by Menahem, who, during his disturbed reign of ten years, becomes a tributary to the Assyrian king, Pul. Pekahian succeeds him to reign only two years before being murdered by Pekah.

Pekah sways a bloody scepter for 20 years before he is assassinated in the conspiracy of Hoshea, the last of the usurpers, who ascends the throne after another chaotic interim of eight years. The administration of Hoshea is ended after nine years by the overthrow of his kingdom and the expatriation of his people.[21] This is frequently called the darkest period in the history of Israel. Hosea describes the land as "an oven heated by the baker."[22] Galilee and Gilead are the first to be captured, and then the Assyrians carry away the northern and eastern part of the nation.

Hosea sees the furious struggle of his own people as being between those who favor Assyria and those who favor Egypt. Men strive against men in plunder, violence, and murder. Force becomes the law as government collapses; right and righteousness are forgotten; life is cheap, lust is common, and unscrupulous selfishness is universal.[23] The prophet sees the crisis approaching his homeland as towns are ravaged and tribes are murdered or scattered as slaves. He offers no apology for rebukes so severe, for menaces so alarming. His soul pours forth its strength in bursts of grief and affection. His invitations are replete with tenderness and pathos, interspersed with warnings and threats, in doleful kina meter reserved for funerals and mourning, and in the voice and character of Jehovah:[24]

> Blow ye the cornet in Gibeah, and the trumpet in Rahah; cry aloud at Bethaven, after thee, O Benjamin. Ephraim

> shall be desolate in the day of rebuke; among the tribes of Israel have I made known that which shall surely be. The princes of Judah were like them that remove the bound: therefore I will pour out my wrath upon them like water.[25]

The Social Setting

The social environment of Hosea's day is one of chaos, confusion, lawless abandonment, selfish indulgence, and tragic indifference. Brokers often take more wheat than required from the farmers; no such thing as justice rules in the courts. Elite controllers of Israelitish society live by the labor of others, secretly wishing the Sabbath day of prayer away that they may again cheat the poor with unfair scales. Even as the people have sworn falsely to God and have broken their covenant with Him, so they also have no scruples in breaking vows with their fellowmen. A man's word is not worth as much as his bond: only as much as his religion.

Infidelity and indulgence have laid siege to the home. "Whoredom and wine, and new wine take away the understanding . . . by swearing, and lying, and killing and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood," Jehovah accuses; "as they were increased, so they sinned against me."[26] Robinson states that family life, especially, disintegrated.[27] Thus Jehovah warns against the sterility of the race caused by rampant social immorality:

> . . . their glory shall fly away like a bird, from the birth and from the womb, and from the conception. Though they bring up their children, yet will I bereave

> them . . . give them a miscarrying womb and dry breasts.[28]

Yet the Lord justly points out that it is not the daughters or wives who are responsible for gross immorality among the women, but it is their brothers, husbands, and fathers who are responsible.[29]

> Hosea was apparently the first man in human history to combat boldly the double standard which places the entire burden of guilt upon the fallen woman and lets the man go free.[30]

Further, the prophet sees something basically wrong in the society that produces harlots and brides who practice adultery. He observes that, not only are their religious practices partly the cause, but the elders who should be setting the example for the young women are leading them astray. (See Hosea 4:13, 14.)

Besides rejecting truth and integrity, the nation has rejected knowledge: "There is no truth, nor knowledge of God in the land."[31] Jehovah testifies: "Though I have redeemed them, yet they have spoken lies against Me. . . . I have written the great things of My law, but they were counted as a strange thing . . . they did not hearken."[32] And again He witnesses, "They were filled, and their heart was exalted; therefore have they forgotten Me . . . the spirit of whoredoms is in the midst of them and they have not known the Lord. . . . They return, but not to the Lord; they will not frame their doings to turn unto their God."[33] The inescapable conclusion is "Therefore the people that doth not understand shall fall. . . . My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge."[34] Jehovah charges that Israel is willfully ignorant: "Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee . . . seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children."[35] Israel "has sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind."[36]

The accepted punishment for an adultress in the eighth century was to have her stripped naked by the people of the community and then stoned to death. This type of punishment was still practiced in the day of Jesus.[37] A milder form of retribution was to take away her clothing and luxuries and to place her on a sparse diet.[38] Yet Hosea stuns his audience by saying he will forgive Gomer for her adulteries, and forget her sin, and receive her again. In this personal revelation of love and mercy, he exemplifies the mercy and compassion of the God of heaven Who is longsuffering and loath to punish. It is this God Who cries, "Oh Ephraim, what shall I do unto thee. . . . How shall I give thee up?"[39]

The Religious Setting

The concept of the unity of Jehovah, a concept long guarded by the Hebrews, is on the verge of disappearing.[40] Israel has almost forgotten the great declaration: "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord."[41] And along with it, they have forgotten the great commandment: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. . . . Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord He is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath: there is none else."[42] Idolatry, Canaanite fertility cults, grove and tree cults, Baal and calf worship, Phoenician Ashtoreth, Moabitic Chemosh, Ammonitic Moloch, Babylonian Adonis, Philistine and Egyptian deities, and sun worship as the Queen of Heaven mix with the worship of Jehovah in a conglomerate religious pattern. Those who visit pagan shrines demand more and more altars on high places to accommodate them. Baal worship especially has become the rival of Jehovah, and the impure and murderous rites of heathen deities are practiced in the shadows of the groves. Common religious practices include sexual orgies, male and female sacred prostitution, self-mutilation, and child sacrifice. Truly, "there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land."[43] There is total lack of morality, integrity, and ethics, all of which are based upon this truth, mercy, and knowledge. Hosea lists as holy places, Beth-aven, Mizpah, Tabor, Gibeah, Ramah, Baal-peor, Gilead, Gilgal, and Bethel. God marvels at the people's blindness, as they worship, among their other idols, the calf or ox, supreme deity in Egypt. "For," he states, "from Israel was it also; the workman made it; therefore it is not God"; and He adds, "The calf of Samaria shall be broken in pieces."[44] Most of the priests were guilty of murder and lewdness, and there was a demand for more altars that they might work out new sins. Since the religious leaders of the people could not be trusted, Hosea observed that it was really they who were causing the people to go astray.

The people of Israel pleased Jeroboam by coming readily into his idolatry, professing to be perfectly happy in their change, and to be greatly advantaged by their new gods; thus they made the king and princes "glad with their lies."[45] The king purposed to make his subjects relinquish their ancient religion, and so, as the prophet says, set fire to his own "oven"--his kingdom, and put the leaven in his dough. This "fire" spread very rapidly, and all Israel rushed into idolatry, and the dough--the people--were soon impregnated with the leaven--the false principles and sin introduced by Jeroboam. Therefore, Jehovah proclaims through Hosea, the oven shall be consumed by these flames, the king, princes, and people enveloped in the burning, and the bread carried off by enemies and strangers. Thus saith the Lord:

> My people ask counsel at their stocks, and their staff declareth unto them: for the spirit of whoredoms hath caused them to err, and they have gone a whoring from under their God. They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under oaks and poplars and elms, because the shadow thereof is good: therefore your daughters shall commit whoredom, and your spouses shall commit adultery.[46]

The Lord through Hosea declares judgment upon those who worship on Mizpah and upon Tabor, and at every other pagan shrine.

> . . . judgment is toward you. The high places . . . the sin of Israel, shall be destroyed: the thorn and the thistle shall come up on their altars; and they shall say to the mountains, Cover us; and to the hills, Fall on us. . . . They shall not dwell in the Lord's land; But Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and they shall eat unclean things in Assyria. For lo, they are gone because of destruction. The days of recompence are come; Israel shall know it. For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings. Israel is an empty vine, he bringeth forth fruit unto himself: according to the multitude of his fruit he hath increased the altars; according to the goodness of his land they have made goodly images. Their heart is divided. They sacrificed to Baalim, and burned incense to graven images.[47]

Because their hearts are divided they do not listen to the prophets through whom Jehovah has spoken, nor heed the multiplied visions He has given. They only continue to worship images of molten silver and other idols, "all of it the work of the craftsmen"[48] and therefore no gods. Yet as ancient method of adoration required, they kissed these works of men's hands as the highest and most genuine act of worship.[49] "The emptiness and the moral pervasiveness which Amos had discerned beneath an apparently prosperous society had come to light. Prosperity that feeds on unrighteousness and spends its ill-gotten gain in self-indulgence is short-lived. Judgment is swift and sure. The time of Israel's dissolution had come. The cup of her iniquity was full and her days were numbered."[50]

The Biblical Exposition

The Text of the Sermons

The text of the sermons of Hosea will be referred to under different headings of discussion, and quoted in appropriate contexts. The book itself is too long to be quoted here.

The Content and Organization of the Sermons

The first three chapters of the book of Hosea are chiefly prose, and tell of the prophet's own experiences with God and with Gomer. Chapters Four through Fourteen contain the messages which Hosea preached, and these are poetic and rhythmical, and considered by most scholars to be "almost indivisible."[51]

The Theme and Purpose of the Sermons.--The theme of Hosea is "O Israel, return unto Jehovah thy God!"[52] The prophet's cry is accentuated by the fact that to him there was but one way to escape certain destruction: the way of repentance. Only repentance would return Israel to the Lord. Some scattered passages present this theme possessing Hosea in his preaching ministry:

> I will go and return to my place till they acknowledge their offence, and seek My face; in their affliction they will seek me earnestly. Come, and let us return unto Jehovah; for He hath torn, and He will heal us; He hath smitten, and He will bind us up. Though I have taught and strengthened their arms, yet do they devise mischief against me. They return, but not to Him that is on high; Sow to yourselves in righteousness, reap according to kindness; break up your fallow ground; for

> it is time to seek Jehovah, till He come and rain righteousness upon you. . . . The more the prophets called them, the more they went from them: . . . because they refused to return to me. Yet I am Jehovah thy God from the land of Egypt; and thou shalt know no god but Me, and besides Me there is no savior.[53]

Hosea presents God as saying, "I will go and return to My place, till they acknowledge their offence, and seek My Face: in their affliction they will see Me earnestly."[54] Then the people find that God is gone from them and they offer a prayer saying, "Come, and let us return unto Jehovah; for He hath torn, and He will heal us; . . . And let us know, let us follow on to know Jehovah."[55] This is the only place in the message of Hosea where the prophet says that it is possible for man to know God of his own desire, and, as George Adam Smith observes, this prayer is discarded, and "God replies that He can make nothing of such ambitions; they will pass away like the morning cloud and the early dew. . . . Elsewhere, in strict conformity to the temper of the Hebrew word to know, Hosea presents the knowledge of the Most High, not as something man finds out for himself, but something which comes down on him from above."[56]

The priests, the people, and the princes of Israel hear the grave warning: "Judgment is toward you, because ye have been a snare on Mizpah, and a net spread upon Tabor."[57] The impiety, idolatry, and ingratitude of Israel are reproved, and the people are warned of severe punishment before the prophet concludes with the plea that might be considered his text, or the epitome of his theme:

> O, Israel, return unto the Lord thy God; for thou hast fallen by thy iniquity. Take with you words, and turn to the Lord; say unto Him, Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously; so will we render the sacrifices of our lips. Asshur shall not save us; we will not ride upon horses; neither will we say any more to the work of our hands, Ye are our gods; for in Thee the fatherless findeth mercy. Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? Prudent, and he shall know them: for the ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them: but the transgressors shall fall therein. . . . Ephraim shall say, What have I to do any more with idols?[58]

The purpose of Hosea is declared by the continual reiteration of his theme: "O, Israel, return unto Jehovah thy God![59] His is the aim of all argumentation, "to change belief and conduct."[60] Recognizing that "belief is really identical with conduct,"[61] he earnestly pleads for convictions to be translated into overt action. Exposing duplicity and sham, he urges that behavior consistent with avowed beliefs is vital for the national, domestic, and individual welfare.

Having commanded the attention of an irresolute audience, he is not content. This interest, won by such personal effort, is not enough. His goal is not entertainment, but persuasion to action. He, too, believed that "the goal of your argumentative process is conversion or complete response. The reactor audience faces a day of judgment. If you succeed, a new man emerges. Belief and conduct change."[62] With dramatic appeals for definite and drastic action, Hosea identifies himself with the traditional prophetic stream of the Jewish religion.

In the message of Amos, the love of God was overshadowed by Law. Hosea's purpose is not to set forth a novel teaching that God is Love, but

> to prove in God so great and new a mercy as was capable of matching the Law, which the abuse of His millennial gentleness now only the more fully justified. There was needed a prophet to arise with as keen a conscience of Law as Amos, himself, and yet affirm that Love was greater still; to admit that Israel were doomed, and yet promise their redemption by processes as reasonable and as ethical as those by which the doom had been rendered inevitable. The prophet of Conscience had to be followed by the prophet of Repentance.[63]

All Israel shall know the exact cause for censure and calamity. The prophet is specific: their sins include no truth, no mercy, no knowledge of God, swearing, lying, killing, stealing, adultery, murder, whoredom, drunkenness, willful ignorance and idolatry.[64] "Ye have plowed wickedness, because thou didst trust in thy way, in the multitude of thy mighty men."[65]

There was no doubt but that Hosea, better than any other man living in his day, was equipped: to show to Israel that God had endured suffering because of His people Israel, and to show them God's willingness to suffer if He could thereby bring His people to repentance. Hosea could preach with power because he had entered into God's suffering. By multiplying his own agony many times he could get a glimpse of the bleeding heart of God at the idolatry and wickedness of His people Israel.

> But they like Adam have transgressed the covenant; there have they dealt treacherously against me. . . . they have sacrificed unto the Baalim and burned incense

to graven images. Israel hath forgotten his Maker.[66]

Hosea believes with all his heart that sin alienates from God any who are caught in its snare, no matter if they be God's chosen people. And again, God says:

> I desire goodness and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.[67]

Hosea knew the heart and holiness of God, and he desired above everything that Israel should return to God.

Structure and Outline of the Sermons.--The book of Hosea is divided by Paton into two periods of the prophet's ministry, and he lists Hosea's teachings in each period. In the first period he includes Chapters 1 and 2:

A. Yahweh's relation to Israel (2:7, 8, 15);
B. Israel's unfaithfulness (2:2-5, 8, 12, 13, 16, 17);
C. Israel's punishment (2:6-13); and
D. Its results (2:14-23; 1:10-2:1).

Teachings in the second period of the prophet's ministry are found in the last section, Chapters 3 to 14, according to Paton.

A. Yahweh's election of Israel (12:9, 12; 13:4; 9:10, et al.);
B. Yahweh's demands (4:1, 2; 6:3, 6-10; 8:1, 2; 10 & 12 et al.);
C. Israel's apostasy (3:1; 4:12-19; 5:3-7; 6:4, 10, et al.);
D. Israel's punishment (3:3, 4; 4:3-10; 5:10-14, et al.);
E. Yahweh's unfailing love (3:1; 11:8, 9);
F. Israel's repentance (3:5; 5:15-6:3; 14:2-5);
G. Israel's restoration (3:5; 11:10, 11; 14:4-8).

The topics set up by Paton find their fulfillment in fragments within many chapters.

The book can also be outlined as follows:

Superscription 1:1 "The word of the Lord that came unto Hosea."

Biographical Account of Hosea's Marriage:

I. The prophet's married life. 1:1-3:5.
  A. His marriage to Gomer. 1:1-9.
  B. A message of hope. 1:10, 11.
  C. Judgment on faithless Israel. 2:1-13.

  D. The restoration of faithless Israel. 2:14-23.
  E. Hosea's redemption of his faithless wife. 3:1-5.

Introduction: "Hear the word of the Lord . . . for the Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land."

II. Israel's unfaithfulness and consequent judgment. 4:1-13:16.
  A. The guilt of the people. 4:1-3.
  B. The guilt of the priests. 4:4-8.
  C. Punishment for all. 4:9, 10.
  D. Immoral cult practices. 4:11-19.
  E. Judgment on kings and priests for leading the people astray. 5:1-7.
  F. Disastrous foreign policies of Ephraim (Israel) and Judah. 5:8-15.
  G. Israel's plea and God's rejoinder. 6:1-6.
  H. The crimes of Israel. 6:7-7:7.
  I. Israel's disastrous foreign policy. 7:8-8:3.
  J. Israel's idolatry and wicked alliances. 8:4-14.
  K. The exile of Israel foretold. 9:1-9.
  L. Israel's ancient apostasy at Baal-peor. 9:10-14.
  M. Israel's apostasy at Gilgal. 9:15-17.
  N. Destruction of the Baal cult prophesied. 10:1-8.
  O. The sin at Gibeah. 10:9, 10.
  P. The ruin of Israel. 10:11-15.
  Q. God's love: Israel's ingratitude. 11:1-7.
  R. God's pity for His people. 11:8-11.
  S. The sins of Jacob. 11:12-12:14.
  T. The wicked bull worship. 13:1-3.
  U. The gracious God to bring destruction. 13:4-11.
  V. Inescapable ruin. 13:12-16.

Theme

O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God.

III. Israel's conversion and renewal. 14:1-9.
    A. The call to repentance. 14:1-9.
    B. The promise of pardon. 14:4-8.
    C. A parting admonition. 14:9.

CONCLUSION When Israel has become wise, they will know God and walk in His ways.

Arrangement and Development of Ideas with Emphasis upon Logos.--The biographical account of Hosea's marriage, together with its failure, is found in the first three chapters. The last eleven chapters are applied and amplified with reference to Israel. The plan and content of the first three chapters and that of the last eleven are obviously different. Each of the first three chapters seems to have its own significance and purpose. The first chapter describes Jehovah's command for Hosea to go take a wife of whoredoms, and also gives the significant names of the children who will be born.

The second chapter deals with the love of Hosea who provides faithfully for his wife in a futile effort to reform her. The guilt of Israel is clearly revealed by the alignment of coinciding circumstances. At this point, however, Hosea does not point out that Israel is the wayward wife. The figure of the land being the spouse of deity is not a new concept. The idea of marriage between Jehovah and Israel underlies the "jealous God" of Exodus,[70] so that Hosea only extends the concept to include a mutual love:

> And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi (husband); and shalt call me no more Baali (my master, or lord). . . . And I will

> betroth thee unto me forever . . . I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness: and thou shalt know the Lord . . . and I will say to them that were not my people, Thou art my people, and they shall say, Thou art my God.[71]

The figure here, Ishi, or "my husband" as opposed to "my master" was a new idea which later was followed out in the New Covenant with Christ and His Church. But lest any should accuse Hosea of naive anthropomorphism, he hastened to add, "I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger; I will not return to destroy Ephraim: for I am God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee." Furthermore, spiritual adultery is a figure of speech drawn from the Canaanite fertility cult, with its ritual prostitution, high places, and groves.

In the third chapter, Hosea redeems his wife from the slavery into which her sin has led her, telling her she shall abide in seclusion, living a quiet life until he is free to take her as his wife. Hosea's experience with Gomer has a counterpart in God's experience with Israel, for she will be "many days without a king, and without a prince" in the land of exile. She will remain without a king until God restores the Davidic king, or Messiah, who will rule as rightful king of Israel.[72] Hosea preached long after David, yet God is set forth as related to David in a peculiar manner. "Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord and his goodness in the latter days (literally "in the end of days.")

Since Gomer has been identified in Chapters 1 and 2, she is not named again in Chapter 3, but the woman whom Hosea redeems is obviously she, for a change of persons would weaken the analogy and lead to misunderstanding.

In Chapters 4 to 14, systematic organization and sequence are totally lacking, and the only discernible progression of thought is the general order of: first, Israel's guilt, then her punishment, and finally her restoration. Or, another way of describing the order is: first, the complaint, in Chapters 4 to 6; then the condemnation, in Chapters 7 to 11; and finally the consolation, in Chapters 12 to 14. Still other ways of subdividing Chapters 4 to 11 are given by Ewald and Kirkpatrick.

Ewald's outline:

(1) 4:1-6, 11a, the arraignment;
(2) 6:11b-9:9, the punishment;
(3) 9:10-14:9, retrospect of Israel's history, exhortation, and comfort.

Kirkpatrick's pattern:

(1) 4-8, Israel's guilt;
(2) 9:1-11:11, Israel's doom;
(3) 11:12-14:9, Israel's retrospect and prospect.

Calkins summarizes the arrangement and development of Hosea's ideas with emphasis upon logos:

1. Religion is inward and spiritual. This relationship is a spiritual bond between God and man as in the marriage relation.

2. The God of righteousness is seen by Hosea as the God of longsuffering love.

3. Hosea is the first prophet to attack idols. (Amos and Elijah demanded worship of God and not of

> idols, but they said nothing against the idols.) Idols are a mockery. (Hosea 8:4-6; 10:5-6; 13:2)[74]

To Hosea, all idolatry is sin against God.

> When Ephraim spake there was trembling; he exalted himself in Israel; but when he offended in Baal, he died. And now they sin more and more, and have made them molten images of their silver, even idols according to their own understanding, all of them the work of the craftsmen . . . yet I am Jehovah, thy God . . . and thou shalt know no god but me, and beside me there is no Savior. (Hosea 2:1, 2, 4).

> Calkin's 4th point is that Hosea . . . anticipated a nation governed by God alone--a theocracy. (Hosea 7:16; 8:4a; 10:2-3; 11:5, 7)

Calkins declares that all four of these cardinal ideas of Hosea's were definitely new.[75]

Hosea presents the new idea that love can be combined with justice, and divine purpose replaces the pagan idea of fickle Fate. Man himself chooses his way, whether to sin and be estranged and punished, or whether to walk in friendship and love with God. Divine love will pursue the wayward one, and divine compassion will use every means to turn him back, for not even justice has the final word. Repentance and return is possible. The God of love yearns for man's answering love.

Hosea names four sins of Israel in the religious realm: First, they had rejected the law of God; second, they had manufactured images for worship; third, they failed to trust in God; and fourth, they gave a wrong interpretation to religion, making it a ritual rather than a Person, to know and love.

Hosea recognizes that emotion governs men as well as reason, and pathos is predominant in his speeches. Yet, Jehovah's words in the sixth chapter, "For I desire mercy and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings," are of great importance in the prophet's thinking. Knowing God and His ways through intimate fellowship, besides learning of His historic acts and words, is the solution to man's own moral problem and problems in relationship to his neighbor. As Kent points out, "Religion is the supreme motive power in all enduring social reform,"[76] and it should be the guide in forming all relationships. Wolfe describes Hosea as a pioneer in opposing foreign alliances, for the prophet urges Israel to repent of those she has made, and to trust in God alone. Hosea also preserves Hebrew religious heritage, Wolfe asserts, by emphasizing religious allegiance, and presenting God as a God of longsuffering love Who willingly restores the repentant one to His favor.[77]

To know God, then, in the way Hosea conceptualizes, involves a complete reformation of the inward man, so that he is capable of seeing God for what He is--of truly KNOWING Him. As a result of this experience, man will be "capable too of turning to the God Whom he thus sees, and giving himself to God in loyal and loving obedience." Amos preaches that God knows Israel, her heart, motives, and thoughts, as well as her ways; but Hosea longs that Israel should know

God, this knowledge being more than that of the intellect. "To know Jehovah is to know him as a tender Father, who taught Ephraim to walk, holding them by their arms, who drew them to Himself with human cords, with bands of love."[79] Hosea's approach to God as Father is so definite that Matthew used it as a typical prophecy of Christ: "When Israel was a child then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." (Compare Hosea 11:1 and Matthew 2:15c.)

Hosea's chief charge against the nation is stupidity, or willful ignorance of God, an ignorance caused by the people's own sin and the guilt of the priests who "eat up the sin of my people and they set their heart on their iniquity."[80] Israel is ignorant of God's character, or she could not be indifferent to Him. Actually, she should follow hard after this most exciting Personality in the universe Who has given her a rich heritage, prosperity, and the beauties and goodness of nature:

> For she did not know that I gave her corn, and wine, and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold. Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord: His going forth is prepared as the morning and He shall come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth. . . . Israel shall cry unto me, My God, we know thee. I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms; but they knew not that I healed them. I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love. When Ephraim was a child, then I loved him, and called My son out of Egypt. . . . I did know thee in the wilderness, in the land of great drought. Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? prudent, and he shall know them? for the ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them: but the transgressors shall fall therein. Ephraim shall say, What have I to do with idols? I have heard Him, and observed Him.[81]

Hosea is the first prophet of repentance. He preaches judgment as being remedial, producing repentance succeeded by newness of life that springs from insight and knowledge of God. Destruction is God's means of discipline to lead His people to know and understand Him and love Him fervently. The Hebrew word for repentance is shubh, meaning "turning or returning." Whereas Amos preaches that the people must do an about-face toward God because "the lion hath roared out of Zion" and judgment is imminent, Hosea calls for repentance and a coming to God because of love and knowledge. He speaks of love so often that he is called not only the "Prophet of Repentance" but "The Prophet of Love." His favorite word, hesedh, is one of the strongest social terms in the Hebrew language. "It describes a love which is expressed not in mere vague emotions but in definite acts of mercy and kindness."[82]

The Mosaic Law had required the love of God as a very major part of the law, though it was not mentioned in the Ten Commandments.[83] In a place of less importance, and classed with "sundry laws," was the admonition to love one's neighbor as oneself,[84] but that law summarized all laws concerning one's attitude toward his neighbor.

Hosea's treatment of Gomer reveals this love. He is the first man in recorded history to announce the love of God for man, insisting that God longs for the answering love of man in vital and intimate companionship. The prophet's concept of love is not weak sentimentality; it is the love of I Corinthians 13, and includes knowledge, forgiveness, long-suffering and judgment. It is the love of God which brings judgment because His laws are broken and thereby men suffer, breaking themselves on the law. For Hosea, the will of God and the gracious Person of God Himself, are primary.

Yet Israel had forgotten God. In religion she turned to the Baals of Canaan with its sexual license.[85] In politics she had set up a king who caused her to sin and to rely upon military power rather than upon God.[86] In foreign relations she had made alliances with Egypt which, far from helping her, had taken the remaining strength of the nation.[87] Since Israel had first been established as a theocracy, they were expected to depend on God for national security as well as in religious matters. To flirt with other nations was just as much spiritual adultery as to worship other idols. It was the burden of Hosea's heart that Israel had played the harlot in turning to other helps in time of need. He saw that the infidelity of his nation to God was just as certain, and perhaps even more heart-breaking, than that of Gomer to him. They had gone to other sources of help so intensively that they were actually working against any effort God could make to help them.[88] Israel's faithlessness, once seen even in Abraham, and in Jacob, brings rivalry, trouble, weakness, inner decay and defeat.

"They are all adulterers . . . They are all hot as an oven, and devour their judges."[89] Hosea knows that wickedness and lack of respect for the moral law will eventually destroy the state. Also, it is apparently a part of his religion to obey the judges and laws of the land. But in Israel's social and domestic life, she no longer practices justice and brotherhood, but deteriorates morally both publicly and privately.[90]

Hosea presents Jehovah as a God of mercy who expects His people to show mercy to their fellowmen:

> And I will betroth thee unto Me forever; Yea, I will betroth thee unto Me in righteousness, and in justice, and in lovingkindness, and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto Me in faithfulness; and thou shalt know Jehovah . . . and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; and I will say to them that were not my people, Thou art My people; and they shall say, Thou art my God.[91]

In the above passage, Hosea sows the seed of a new teaching which was to be championed by Christ Himself, and which was diametrically opposed to crass legalism. On one occasion, when Christ is questioned by the legalists concerning His association with sinners, He tells them to go and learn what Hosea means by setting mercy above sacrifice. When the disciples of Christ disobey a technical point of the legalistic code, Christ reminds the legalists that they have not yet learned what Hosea means.[92]

One definition of religion in the Bible given by name, is made by James, the brother of the Lord, when he says in effect, "Visit the needy but go in the eyes of God."[93] Thus he sets forth the vertical and horizontal dimensions of the cross, and of all true religion. Eight hundred years before, these two directions of religion are set forth by Hosea when he requires his people to "do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God."[94]

Never until Jesus comes preaching, is the heart of God uncovered as Hosea uncovers it. Until Christ comes and proves the validity of Hosea's revelation, men do not think God can be such as Hosea pictures Him. Indeed, even the teaching of Isaiah, objective though it be, is beyond the understanding of the people.[95] Hosea believes and teaches that God is willing to suffer all that is necessary in order to reconcile His people to Himself. Looking back from his day, Hosea can speak for God, "I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love; and I was to them as they that lift up the yoke on their jaws; and I laid food before them."[96] The prophet has gone through an experience which adds a tone of sympathy to his voice and a note of understanding to his heart as he speaks. God is speaking these beautiful words after Israel has failed Him. Had Israel been walking with God in the eighth century, B.C., these words would have rung with exaltation. But in spite of the broken heart of God, He is not through pleading with His people.

> I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely; for mine anger is turned away from him.[97]

Hosea is correct, and Christ proves it, that God is willing to suffer if by so doing He can bring His people nearer to

Himself.

These eighth-century Hebrew prophets, Amos and Hosea, possess a personal religion which has a vertical direction in that they are related to God through their religion. They believe that man's dealings with God should be governed by God's nature. To them, God is righteous; therefore, man should be righteous. One emphasizes the judgment of God which will come upon the sinner, while the other, not ignoring the sin but seeking pardon through repentance, definitely portrays the merciful nature of God.

The Rhetorical Analysis

It has been said that "what holds attention, controls action," and while this is perhaps an overstatement, there is no doubt that without securing attention, speakers rarely move an audience to the action the orators desire.[98] Attention has been defined psychologically as "readiness to respond,"[99] but much that commands attention does not produce the desired response in belief and behavior.

William James suggests that belief consists in a desire to carry out a proposition in action.[100] However, producing the desired belief and consequent behavior is not merely the result of gaining attention, but rather the product of persuasive speaking. Persuasive speaking may establish, or intensify, weaken, or replace a belief and attempt to influence action.

Whether Hosea was successful in the eyes of man is not fully known. That God's providential care has preserved his messages for His followers today indicates that the prophet was successful in the sight of God.

The Response to the Sermons

Hosea speaks in a tense speaker-audience situation. He is a man with an urgent message, but with an audience indifferent, calloused, and in part, hostile toward him. The prophet is always in danger. Members of the opposing party lie in wait to destroy him, for the prophets are considered to be party members of one or the other of the furiously struggling political factions. The very fact that the prophet dares to speak, then, at all, arouses the animosity of political cliques.

However, Hosea uses the element of conflict with rare effectiveness. His controversy arouses interest. The conflicting emotions which seem to struggle for supremacy within his speech hold the attention. Hosea moves his audience into a receptive attitude by subtly arousing the sympathies of the audience for himself, as the betrayed husband, and by awakening resentment toward his unfaithful wife. He, no doubt, felt a large majority of his audience "with him" as he made the characters of the tragedy become alive in the midst of direct conversation, direct commands, and personal pleadings and promises. The men of the audience may have been filled with anger and wrath, and indignation and shame may have burned within the women, the children standing in stunned silence as the prophet declared his intended reprisals against his unfaithful wife. He threatens to "strip her naked,"[101] "slay her with thirst,"[102] "hedge up her way with thorns and make a wall that she shall not find her paths."[103]

> Therefore . . . I will recover my wool and my flax given to cover her nakedness. And now will I discover her lewdness in the sight of her lovers and none shall deliver her out of my hand . . . whereof she hath said, These are my rewards that my lovers have given me; and I will make them a forest, and the beasts of the field shall eat them.[104]

The movement of the narrative in this extended analogy brings the entire congregation to agree that such punishment is justly deserved by the harlot. The subtle orator continues and the audience is stunned as he promises suddenly, with an unprecedented shift in sentiment:

> Behold, I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness and speak comfortably unto her. And I will give her her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope; and she shall sing there as in the days of her youth.[105]

Before the startled audience can comprehend any reason for such a soft and sentimental course of action, they suddenly are made to realize that in the same manner, the Lord is the husband of the corrupt, poor land. Jehovah is husband of a faithless Israel, a harlot, and He promises them another opportunity to repent and to prove their loyalty, though the nation sits as a prostitute among the fruit of her evil doings.

While very few individuals in an audience would have experienced personally the prophet's heartache, yet such situations would be recalled readily by each one at the slightest reference to such a case. The sight of the unfortunate children or husband of some local harlot would serve as constant reminders. The original intensity of this experience is so shocking that the imagination and sympathetic interest of the audience is immediately aroused. The figures of speech based upon daily occurrences may lack great original intensity, but their frequency forms a basis of sufficient strength that a reference to a similar experience arouses or sustains the attention.

Having heightened the conflict with his wayward wife until the antagonism and anger of the audience is aroused against her, Hosea abruptly awakens their stolid sensibilities with the scathing assertion, "The Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land."[106]

The prophet also antagonizes his audience by recurring references to their disloyalty and infidelity, but he is able by his sincere interest in their welfare, and by their already tenderized hearts toward him, to maintain their attention until he finishes his warning, extends his invitation, and portrays the bright prospects which are promised as a reward for repentance. Hosea seems to make no attempt "to find out what motives are of primary importance to the members of the audience at the time of the talk, and then plan appeals to these particular primary motives."[107] Instead, he abandons reserved respectability in an all-out attempt to foment moral revolution and restoration by the strongest use of most impelling motives known to be effective in changing human attitudes and directing human behavior, chiefly, "the desire for preservation of life and health."[108]

With sharp, incisive strokes, Hosea hammers and chisels his way into the calloused hearts of his hearers with the accusation that they are likewise unfaithful to Jehovah, pursuing other gods and rejoicing in new, but illicit relations with pagan idolatrous practices. By his words against Jehu in particular and against all of the rulers in general, the prophet angers his audience against himself. He incites the opposition of the religious people by his speaking against the priests with their pagan rites. Most of his congregation are so demoralized that his passionate pleas have no effect on them. They are indifferent to the announcement that God has suffered because of their sin. They are not moved by the compassion of God.

Yet that some repent, there is no doubt. When the conviction of sin comes, with it comes the cry of despair. They recall, finally, the unimpeachable condemnation that Amos has hurled at their feet, and as they witness the drama of Hosea's life, they know that God has departed from them. "I will go and return to My place," the Lord has said.[109]

No punishment God can mete out to His people can be more severe than that of alienation. No hope for the future remains if God is no longer with them. Yet Hosea shows them that God's love is the father of a mercy which is itself greater than the law which they have transgressed. Two things are necessary if their prayer of reconciliation is to be answered: they must be true-hearted in their penitence, and they must realize that all the repentance in the world without God's willing mercy would avail them nothing.[110]

God is willing to suffer if by so doing His children will repent and return to Him. Hosea proves this to his congregation by his treatment of Gomer; that many of them repent there is no doubt, for communion with God is a desire of the human soul.

The long-range response to the sermon of Hosea is the complete fulfillment of his prophecies against Israel. The fulfillment comes with the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C. Forays into Judah continue; commerce is restricted; then, Judah is carried into the Babylonian captivity about 700 B.C.

The Appropriateness of the Theme to the Occasion and Audience

Hosea assumes that he has an enlightened audience who will understand both the appropriateness of his theme and the occasion on which he presents it. He does not develop his accusations or his allusions. The people understand them without elaboration. The sins of the people and the negligence of priests have made them forget the law of the Lord. The "people are destroyed for lack of knowledge"[111] and Hosea believes they can be brought to see these facts.

The initial statement introduces an uncommon organization. The prophet relates his own domestic history for an introductory device to win attention and to form a basis for the later developments and applications which stun his auditors with the realization that an ancient message has been forced upon them by an unusual example and comparison. An ancient message, indeed: One that has always been presented by one of the prophets of the Lord for them, and to them, at crucial moments in their history: "O, Israel: Return unto the Lord, and know thy God!"

Hosea considers it altogether appropriate to speak out against the chief sins that he sees in the history of Israel, and it was altogether appropriate that he do this, since it was for these sins in the past that she was threatened with annihilation even as now: "Israel, you seek security in arms and alliances, instead of the Lord your God!"[112] "My people, you have instituted monarchy to stand between the nation and God!" He does not speak only against the dynasty of Jehu now,[113] but also against others.[114] Finally, Hosea cries out against the nation's idolatry.[115]

"Knowledge" and "understanding" form an important basis of the theme. Hosea has a critical complaint against his people at this precise time in their history because they do not know God.

> In brief, we are to take know as meaning not only knowledge, but also the practical application which knowledge calls for. It is understanding, or comprehension, but more; for to know God is to feel the force of the deity and to act accordingly, i.e., to have the feeling (of love, or duty, or whatever else) which a knowledge of God implies. To come to know God, then, means to come to a new state of mind.[116]

This knowledge is prevented by the evil life of the people[117] and the failure of the religious leaders to do their duty.[118]

The prophet's message of emphasis upon knowledge and reason is summarized in these words:

> Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee. . . . For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings. . . . and thou shalt know no god but me: for there is no Savior beside Me. . . . Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? prudent, and he shall know them? for the ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them: but the transgressors shall fall therein.[119]

Hosea is prudently reasonable, both in his theme and the occasion; he is logical in his conclusions. However, as we shall see under the section concerning the structure of his sermons, he is not always bound to logical argument in development.

The prophet is able to interest the audience because he is persuaded that he has something worth saying, but if he is to be vital and move the listeners to action, he must relate his words and thought to the interests of his hearers. An intended stimulus becomes a source of motivation when a speaker realizes that people are interested in things involving their own personal welfare, and he is able to relate or identify his recommended course of action with the welfare of the individual.

The Structure of the Sermons

The headings under which the sources of persuasion in Hosea will be considered, will include those which have been traditional since Aristotle. The classical divisions of appeals are: logic or argument; found in the structure of a speech; pathetic or emotional; and ethical or character. These instruments of persuasion are the tools used by a speaker "to influence the judgment and action of listeners."[120]

The persuasive speaking of Hosea deals not with matters of fact, for the facts are all too obvious, but rather with matters of policy in which he aims "not only to influence belief but also to induce action."[121] In order to develop such a speech, "certain inquiries into the past and predictions as to the future must be made."[122] By the use of analogy, by appeal to history, by causal reasoning, by stern threats, and by glowing predictions of future prosperity to be poured out upon the upright, Hosea attempts to change belief and influence right behavior.

"Argument is the most usual, and certainly the most tangible method of changing belief."[123] The foundation of persuasive speaking is logic, or argument, which is a process of "arriving at a conclusion through the intermediary development of certain premises."[124] It has been said that if logic is at all related to the well-being of the audience, this is only accidental, since it seeks not what is desirable, but rather what is true.[125] Hosea's combination of logic and emotion in style and content may overcome what will be seen as weaknesses in his formal logic or argument.

Lack of Logical Arrangement: Suggested Divisions.--The book of Hosea may be divided into two unequal sections; the first tells of his preparation and the second is a short epitome of his sermons. The title to the book, previously indicated as revealing that he preached during the reign of Jeroboam II, King of Judah, is contended by some to apply only to the first three chapters of his book. The last eleven reflect a later date. Jeroboam II, died about 743 B.C., and sometime during the last six years of his reign, the preaching of Amos ceased and that of Hosea began. It is possible that Hosea's courtship of Gomer and his future and experience with her, took place even while Amos was preaching. Then, Chapter Four, which is really the beginning of the message of Hosea, could have been preached after the death of Jeroboam during that period of decay and unrest in the kingdom. The entire eleven chapters of Hosea's messages present a nation which surely was headed for destruction.

Dean Farrar would divide the message of Hosea into five parts, and place each part during the reign of a king, according to internal evidences.[126] The first part--Hosea 4:1-6:3--he assigns to the wild days of anarchy and confusion during the reign of Zechariah immediately following the death of Jeroboam II. The second part--Hosea 6:4-7:16--he thinks must have been preached during the reign of Menahem. The phrase, "all the kings are fallen," is fitting, he feels, after the murder of two kings within six months. Farrar would place the third division--Hosea 8:1-9:9--also during the reign of Menahem, but after he had become a vassal of the king of Assyria. This situation is reflected in the statement, "Yea, though they hire among the nations, now will I gather them; and they begin to be diminished by reason of the burden of the king of princes." This "king" is thought to be none other than Tiglath-Pileser whose private name was Pul.[127] Farrar is almost certain that the fourth section--Hosea 9:11-11:11--was written under King Hoshea. He also places the last division at the close of the reign of Hosea--Hosea 12:1-14:9. It was evidently written before the crash, during the last crisis of the nation, but while there was yet hope for a future.

Whether these divisions are accurate will never be known. It is a matter of knowledge, however, that Hosea preached in the time of Israel's rapid decay, and to a congregation rotting in the immorality of centuries.

Various stages in the speeches of Hosea are also suggested by Wolfe, but he has to discard much of the sermons in order to reach these conclusions. Wolfe imagines that the respective stages at which the three children are born, correspond to three phases in the development of Hosea's message. Although the first addresses are full of reproofs and warnings, they are spoken in a hopeful spirit. Only the rulers and their revolutionary rivals are declared doomed. In the second period, Hosea comes to fear for the entire nation. He goes so far as to declare that Yahweh is ready to withdraw all compassion and love. The final state of Hosea's message, represented by the naming of the third child, is characterized by hopelessness. Wolfe says:

> Yahweh was at the point of disowning the nation and bringing destruction upon her. Thus, in the course of a prophetic ministry of only a few years, Hosea trod the path leading from hope to despair.[128]

All of those who seek to find some basis for division of the book of Hosea agree that it is not in logical order. It actually defies all attempts to so divide it. Hosea addressed the people only because he had made a great discovery. As he saw the daily development of his congregation he added to that message. It was not his purpose to prove to the children of Israel that God's love included mercy; he showed that to them. To him, judgment did not come because of the results of sin, but because of the fact that judgment was potentially in the act of sin. If there were any order in Hosea's message, it is incidental and perhaps not consciously premeditated. Hosea knew that a society would be no better than its individuals, so in the beginning of his first sermon, he arraigned personal sins.

Theoretically, then, the message of Hosea may be viewed in three logical steps: (1) Sin; (2) Judgment; and (3) Loving mercy. Harrell states that Hosea was essentially a man of poetic mold, and he thinks that fact is one of the reasons why logical arrangement is not found in his book, as in the book of Amos.[129]

> His (Hosea's) language and the movement of his thoughts are far removed from the simplicity and self-control which characterize the prophecy of Amos. Indignation and sorrow, tenderness and severity, faith in the sovereignty of Jehovah's love, and a despairing sense of Israel's infidelity are woven together in a sequence which has no logical plan. Hosea, above all the other prophets, is a man of deep affections, of a gentle poetic nature.[130]

Lack of One Definite Climax.--Climax in Hosea is not achieved by following a logical pattern to a final high point, either, and ending with a graceful denouement. Accusations, threats, calamities, promises, and climaxes are found scattered throughout the book. For instance, climaxes seem to be found in the following places: Hosea 1:11, 12; 2:14-23; 3:5; 5:15; 6:3; 11:9; 12:6; 13:14. To some readers, one of these may be the primary climax.

The climax of Hosea's message may be reached at the close of the thirteenth chapter when he says, "Samaria shall bear her guilt; for she hath rebelled against God."[131] Or, it may be considered to be reached later when he calls them to repent; or even later still in the words, "I will heal their back-sliding, I will love them freely."[132] The climax reserved at the end of Chapter Fourteen might be considered a primary one. To some it may seem that this climax is actually in the final sentence when the outcome is made to rest upon individual response: "The ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them: but the transgressors shall fall therein."[133] Or, Hosea's high point may be reached when he looks ahead to that time when Ephraim shall say, "What have I to do anymore with idols?"[134] In reality, no climax is ever given for either the domestic or the national story. The element of uncertainty is an enduring and integral part of Hosea. Hosea paints a vivid picture; he economizes on words and time, and the result is a sermon neither he nor his scattered audiences can easily forget.

Unlike Amos, whose climax has to do with the ethical life of the people, Hosea's preaching is practically concentrated on the relationship of Israel to God. Israel has sinned in countless ways, but Hosea realizes that the greatest sin of all is that transgression of the covenant whereby they have dealt treacherously with God.[135] It is Ephraim's spiritual harlotry, his continually going after illicit gods, that causes the greatest breach between the true God and them.

Presence of Conflict.--At times the speech of Hosea seems to rush out as disconnected, unbalanced utterance with half-developed allusions which are torn to fragments by his own inner torment. His own grief causes him to change from one emotion to another: tenderness to indignation; love to bitterness; leniency to severity and back again. Hope turns into despair.

The sequence of the sermons, then, has no logical basis, but seems to be determined by the alternate struggle and victory of the prophet's own contending emotions. An element of unity throughout is his faith in Jehovah's love for Israel, like the affection which binds the prophet himself to Gomer.

Other elements of conflict within the sermons are those of knowledge grappling with ignorance, morality against immorality, Jehovah worship threatened by Baal worship, real love matched against infidelity, and divine love against human lust.

Hosea uses conflict throughout. The prophet is set against his wife; the children are against their mother; the husband and father is against the lustful lovers; the priests are against the prophet; evil ways oppose right ways; the present opposes the future; enemies are against Israel; the people's profession is in opposition to their popular practices; the counsel of their idols contradicts the counsel of God; and God stands firm against a disobedient people.

Presence of Logical Appeals.--Logical appeal is employed by Hosea when he emphasizes causal relationships. He reminds the people of their past, urging them to remember and to direct their lives according to the knowledge which they have. Ephraim (Israel) is a silly pigeon without understanding, because they call to Egypt and fly to Assyria.[136] Since cause and effect are stressed by Hosea, his use of words shows this emphasis. For instance: "therefore" is used 23 times, "for" 55 times, "because" 15 times, "yet" 10 times, "but" 21 times. He sometimes omits elements of the logical process, but the logical framework repeatedly is shown. For example, he does not try to prove causal relationships which he asserts, but frequently he states that some effect is produced by a stated cause. At other times he says that certain effects of the future will follow in the wake of today's actions or attitudes.

Thus, while Hosea does not use a formal logical or argumentative construction, he does rely heavily upon the force of logic to convince his audience. By causal reasoning which proceeds from cause to effect, effect to effect, and from effect to cause, he traces the consequence of immorality and the lack of knowledge. The machinery of this kind of reasoning is hidden among the graphic images he employs; his use of logical argument is informal and inconspicuous. But, as has been noted, the frequent usage of "therefore," "because," and "for," also show causal relationship in his reasonable and reasoning approach.

The personal experience of Hosea made it impossible for him to deliver a logical message. The intellect and emotions are represented in the preaching of Amos and Hosea respectively, but the emotion in Hosea even supercedes the intellect in Amos. Because his immediate purpose was different, and since his background was unique, Hosea developed a technique in preaching which was new to his day. Hosea's statements often appear so simple that they can be passed over too lightly, so that the weight of such spiritual meaning as is in statements like "the knowledge of God," is overlooked.

Lack of Sequence.--Concerning transitional materials, Hosea uses many transitional words, but transitions between thought units are not always clear. For example, his frequent use of the words "and" (252 times), "for" (55 times), and "but" (21 times), appears to be primarily for the purpose of connecting clauses in compound sentences, or to follow a thought to its conclusion, rather than of guiding the listening audience to another thought or progressive subject in his speech. The use of short thought patterns, figurative speech, and highly emotional utterances tend to reduce the use of clear, precise transitions.

Therefore, the matter of sequence in Hosea's speeches presents special problems. No clearly defined boundaries exist in his speeches so that there is no universal agreement as to the number, completeness, or meaning of his addresses. Short thought units which are used without adequate transitional material create a cluttered effect and add complexity to the book. Figures of speech are gathered in clusters without elaboration or explanation, just as the emotional shifts are.

When the book is considered as a whole, there seems to be a better sequence. A previously noted example: the narrative of Hosea's family life in the first section of his book, provides a basis for his messages to Israel in the latter part of the book. Usually he traces the moral failures of today to the judgments of the future, but sometimes he re-reverses the technique to emphasize that their present difficulties are the result of their past delinquencies. Progress and development are lively from the beginning, "and the Lord said unto Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife . . ."[137] The message of Hosea is thus given in the framework of a story as he relates his own experience. The whole book becomes an extended analogy, a sorrowful sequence, demonstrating the divine-human relationship ruptured by the moral meanderings of a willful people. The only progress of thought discernible is the general category of Israel's guilt, punishment, and restoration. Yet, as Paton's outline reveals (see p. 17), even these topics are scattered throughout the chapters in small excerpts. Actually, there is complete lack of order and sequence in the messages of

Hosea. One commentator of renown summarizes a discussion of the structure of Hosea's discourses by boldly affirming, "There is no trace in them of oratorical art."[138]

Analysis of Style and Delivery

In the abrupt variety and delivery of Hosea, there is a certain kind of unity of style. There is unity of feeling and unity of purpose.[139] There is a sublime simplicity and concrete imagery, a style that demands attention and interest. There is an apparent disconnected coherence, but above all, there is the impelling feeling of the prophet that the welfare of his people is at stake.

In some characteristics, the style of Hosea is unique. Jerome, in his Preface to Minor Prophets, speaks of it as "broken up into short clauses." Even the factors of grammar are almost too much for Hosea's vehement feelings. As Eisclen suggests:

> Hosea was a man of sensitive nature; his emotions were profoundly stirred; the truth burned in his heart; in sympathy and anguish he poured out his very soul, without any attempt to indicate the logical connection between the separate utterances. This, the hearers might supply.[140]

The stylistic elements of Hosea's speech are to be considered under the divisions used for Paul's discourses at Antioch and at Athens, and for the speech of Amos, also. That is, the message of Hosea will be considered for its stylistic elements of Correctness, Propriety, Perspicuity, and Ornamentation.

According to Deane, Hosea has no time for the niceties of parallelism and for balancing of clauses, for well-considered correctness of word forms, sounds, and grammatical uses of words.

> His grief, his upbraidings, his pleadings, are artless and untrammelled. In his vehemence, he oversteps the bounds of grammatical propriety, and hurries the hearer along, regardless of rules which a less feeling writer would have been careful to observe. Abruptly, he passes from one image to another without fully developing either; he draws his figures from the field, the mountain, the forest.[141]

The earlier section of Hosea's book is more smooth and flowing, but the last eleven chapters can only be described as abrupt, urgent, nervous, irregular, and somewhat obscure, overstepping "the bounds of grammatical propriety." Smith believes that some passages are only the play of the prophet's mind, not set speech prepared for delivery publicly, nor formally addressed to an audience, since there is "no trace in them of oratorical art."[142]

Brooks Peters Church notes the prophet's style which causes his audience to appropriately sense the impending doom hovering over them: "a nervous hurry in his style, due perhaps to the strain under which he lived so long" and which he knows is to come upon all his people.[143] This style of Hosea, then, is appropriate to the audience and occasion. These are people who can understand his bucolic figures of speech, and the cry of the heart of a man who has experienced what Hosea has known. This audience also must recognize the ancient message of the Lord Jehovah, calling

His wayward people *again* back to Himself.

However one may feel about the style of Hosea in itself, it must be conceded that it was the appropriate overflow of the true feelings of the prophet, and his circumstances, and of those present and coming circumstances of his audience. Therefore, with the exception of his grammar, his style exemplifies *propriety*.

The following four standards for analyzing *perspicuity* indicate that his contemporaries should fully understand the message of Hosea. It is true that clarity is hindered by lack of continuity, by fragmentary units, uncertain translation, obscurity in meaning, undeveloped allusions and references, yet other elements serve to clarify his speeches.

1. *Thorough knowledge and understanding of the ideas*: Few of Hosea's readers today, or his listeners of his own time, could refute his right or ability to speak clearly about the knowledge of God through insight and experience, or about forgiveness and repentance, and sin against love. These are his main subjects, interrelated with other matters scattered throughout his sermons.

2. *Discerning vocabulary*: Hosea has few favorite words because of his vocabulary variety. Although he speaks throughout on the same subject, his vocabulary is so varied and extensive that he finds many different words to express his ideas. The most characteristic word of Hosea, however, as might be expected, is *hesedh* (*chesed*).[144] *Hesedh* (see

Hosea 2:19; 4:1; 6:4; 10:12; 12:6) is translated love, mercy, good faith and loyalty, and lovingkindness. Hosea's indictment of Israel's sin against love takes many forms, with concrete, vigorous terminology predominating.

> whoredom; not my people; adultery; children of whoredoms; played the harlot; done shamefully; go after lovers; seek lovers; burned incense to Baalim; forgot Me; look to other gods; no knowledge of God in the land; forgotten the law; sinned against Me; set their heart on their iniquity; spirit of whoredoms hath caused them to err; sacrifice with harlots; joined to his idols; a snare on Mizpah; a net spread upon Tabor; Israel is defiled; will not frame their doings to turn unto their God; dealt treacherously against the Lord; begotten strange children; they commit lewdness; commit falsehood; consider not in their hearts; none among them calleth unto Me; spoken lies against Me; rebel against Me; not cried against Me; set up kings but not by Me; forgotten his Maker; ye have plowed wickedness; ye have reaped iniquity; thou didst trust in thy way; trust in the multitude of thy mighty men; knew not that I healed them; they were filled; their heart was exalted; therefore have they forgotten Me; thou hast destroyed thyself; an unwise son, thou hast fallen by thine iniquity.

Hosea makes clear the charges against Israel in discerning terms and in detail. He seems to carefully select those words which will create the greatest impact on his listeners. His words are concrete; concepts are clothed in emotional words and graphic terms, illuminated by specific instances. For example, God tells those who forget His commandments, "I will also forget thy children"; and idol worshippers "gone a-whoring from their God" are warned that their daughters and spouses shall also commit adultery. At one point, God is described as being as a moth unto Ephraim, while Ephraim is described as a backsliding heifer . . .

certainly not difficult terms to understand. Hosea's precise selection of words helps facilitate the prompt understanding of his message.

3. Simplicity of grammar: The perspicuity of Hosea is somewhat helped by his variety of sentence structure, but his grammar is not simple. In the 197 verses of the 14 chapters of the King James version of Hosea, there are 207 sentences. Of these, 15 are questions and 3 are exclamations. The declarative sentences are either compound or complex, for only a few simple sentences are scattered throughout the book. These include such short ones as, "From me is thy mouth" in the eighth chapter. However, no exceptionally long sentences exist. One sentence continues for 3 verses, making use of 57 words; and 5 sentences range from 44 to 69 words in length, extending for 2 verses each. Several verses have over 40 words in a sentence, and one sentence consists of 55 words within a single verse (Hosea 2:18). Cumulative statements and connectives such as "and" (250 times) help make sentences appear more simple. The connective "but" is used 21 times to show contrast. Sentences with this kind of structure are not too obscure to understand. Yet short, powerful sentences are used seldom; the long series of clauses strung together with "and," "but," "for," "so," "yet," and "therefore," are far more favored by the prophet.

In some instances, Hosea uses inversion: "then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord" (Hosea 6:3), and "In their affliction they will seek Me early" (Hosea 5:15), and "Israel served for a wife, and for a wife he kept sheep" (Hosea 12:12). In his last discourse, he uses the encouraging inversion, "From Me is thy fruit found" (Hosea 14:8).

Hosea's most common sentence structure is the cumulative listing of charges followed by a clause which begins with the devastating word, "therefore." He uses "so that" only twice, but his habit of tracing human behavior to its ultimate consequences is obvious even in his rather complex grammar.

4. Direct discourse: Direct discourse, as used in the book of Hosea, creates both energy and obscurity. It does not contribute to perspicuity. Much of the book is recorded in the first person without identifying the speaker. Sometimes the prophet quotes Jehovah without stating the impersonation. Some cases of direct discourse are only one- or two-word utterances, while others continue for several verses. For example, there is an unexplained shift in the sixth chapter between the third and fourth verses. The Lord seems to be the speaker for 45 continuous verses, from Hosea 6:4-9:7; the following two verses seem to be the words of the prophet; then the speech of the Lord continues for four verses before there is a reversal to the words of the prophet in the fourteenth verse. Thirty-two examples of

direct discourse can be broken down in the following manner: Eleven times Hosea says that God is being quoted directly. Six times he reveals that he, himself, is the speaker. Fifteen times he quotes others. The forces of these different types of sentence structure combine to create energy in Hosea's style. He seems to drive his message into the consciousnesses of his audience from every quarter. The extent to which he uses direct discourse is more clearly seen when his first-person pronouns, "I, me, my, mine, we, our, us," are tabulated.

Personal pronouns indicate the direct thrust of the prophet. He uses 231 first-person pronouns, 106 second-person pronouns, and 522 third-person pronouns. Plurality among the third-person pronouns is found 268 times. The 208 times the singular first-person pronouns, "I, me, my, mine" are used, indicate the direct words of the prophet, chiefly in the person of Jehovah. The 106 second-person pronouns, "thee, thy, ye, you, your," show the force of the prophet in fearlessly accosting his audience with his direct accusations. Of the 24 plural pronouns in the first person, "we, our, us," which are used throughout the book, 21 are found in Chapters Six, Ten, and Fourteen.

All of these various objective elements are effectively combined by Hosea to create a forceful style. He creates the impression of direct discourse throughout, without actually always stating when and whom he is quoting. He uses long quotations with an abundance of pronouns in the first and second persons.

Perspicuity is not the leading characteristic of Hosea. His message is made vivid by the fact that the details of his marital failure are shown to parallel Israel's relation to Jehovah. This basis of his message is most graphically clear. But the components of his speeches with their relationship to his entire career, the precise meaning of all parts, and the full content of his speeches are factors shrouded in obscurity. Hosea's perspicuity is impaired by the use of many isolated figures, by the lack of transitions from one big idea to another, by frequent failure to indicate change of speakers, by the lack of organization into logical units, and by lack of amplification regarding some ideas. But despite these limitations, the intent of Hosea's message to a wayward people is clear. Though there may be unexplained changes of person, anomalies of gender, number, and construction, Hosea transmits his ideas clearly enough to be understood.

The prophet is wise in his use of much ornamentation. He uses analogy, example and illustration, balance or poetic parallelism, antithesis, repetition, allusion, imagery of all kinds, figures of speech including similes and metaphors, assonance, personification, rhetorical questions and progression, suspense and climax.

Hosea knows he must bring his scattered audience, standing scornfully aloof, into the range of persuasion and influence. He must hold their fickle attention and selfish interest until they are led to see their own true position and the results of infidelity to Jehovah. Therefore, the prophet's subject must be related to the existing fundamental interests of the audience.[145] If a bawdy people attend only to sensual stimuli, he will tell his story of illicit intercourse, thus meeting his associates on their own level. But he appears to realize, too, that "mere novelty may catch, but cannot hold attention."[146] Interest is derived through illustration, through the use of the familiar, but not the trite, through sensational methods and ornamentation.[147]

Hosea's book as a whole has been called an extended analogy because he compares his wayward nation with his own unfaithful wife. He often states similarities by the use of "like" and "as." Some examples are: "as a wilderness; like a dry land; as a back-sliding heifer; like them that remove the bound; as troops of robbers; as an oven; like a silly dove; like a deceitful bow; a wild ass; as hemlock; as heaps; as chaff; as smoke."

The prophet's examples and illustrations are specific, definite, and concrete. Brevity marks each example. Imagination is stimulated and attention is held as the prophet leaves the details of each figure to be supplied by the listener. His common, yet vivid illustrations, have a wide scope, and clearly portray the ideas of Hosea. It will be noted that he does develop a few figures, making application of the terms adultery, harlotry, sickness, injury, and baker's oven. However, other illustrative material is given without application or amplification. Some examples and illustrations are as follows:

> Gomer's unfaithfulness to her husband and children; Hosea's provision for her; the purchase of Gomer at the market; as a lion; as a crouching leopard watches; avenge the blood; I will not save them by bow; nor by sword, nor by battle; by horses, nor by horsemen; sons of the living God; her naked; decked herself with earrings and her jewels; she went after her lovers.

Still other diversified examples for clarity include:

> As a bear bereaved of her whelps; infants dashed in pieces; women with child shall be ripped up; fallen by iniquity; bread of mourners; spring shall become dry; his fountain shall be dried up; as a lamb in a large place; the wind hath bound her up in her wings; Ephraim saw his sickness; Judah saw his wound; he could not heal you; he could not cure your wound; as an oven heated by the baker; bring them down as fowls; thy calf hath cast thee off; thorns shall be in their tabernacles; wanderers among the nations; judgment springeth up as hemlock in the furrows; bind themselves in their two furrows; break up fallow ground; Israel was a child; consume his branches; in the land of great drought; according to their pasture so were they filled; the wild beast shall tear them; I will ransom them from the power of the grave.

In literary style, Hosea popularizes the parable.[148] His Chapters Four through Fourteen are also filled with the symmetry and beauty of Hebrew poetry. His balance or poetic parallelism can be illustrated by the following passages:

> My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge; because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me. Seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy

> children. Come, and let us return unto the Lord; for He hath torn, and He will heal us; He hath smitten, and He will bind us up. They have set kings, but not by me: they have made princes, and I knew it not.[149]

Antithesis accounts for some of the symmetry, beauty, and energy of Hosea:

> They shall go with their flocks and their herds to seek the Lord; but they shall not find Him: He hath withdrawn Himself from them. Israel . . . buildeth temples; and Judah . . . fenced cities; but I will send a fire upon his cities, and it shall devour the palaces thereof. I found Israel like grapes in the wilderness; but they went to Baal-poer, and separated themselves unto that shame; For I am God and not man; For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings. But they like man have transgressed the covenant: I have written unto him the great things of my law, but they were counted as a strange thing. They shall not dwell in the Lord's land; but Ephraim shall return to Egypt. When Ephraim spake trembling, he exalted himself in Israel; But when he offended in Baal, he died. O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in Me is thine help. For the ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them: but the transgressors shall fall therein.[150]

The repetition of Hosea's basic ideas of knowledge, repentance, and sin against love is framed in varied terms. Few sentences are repeated; that is, there are few instances of exact duplication, but there are many examples of reiterating in a forceful manner by using variety:

> The Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land. . . . The Lord hath also a controversy with Judah. They were filled, and their heart was exalted; I will punish them for their ways, and reward them for their doings; He hath torn and He will heal us; He hath smitten, and He will bind us up. Strangers have devoured his strength, and he knoweth it not; Yea, gray hairs are here and there upon him, yet he knoweth not. Israel served for a wife, and for a wife he kept sheep. . . . Therefore they shall be as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that passeth away, as the chaff that is driven with the whirlwind out of the

> floor, and as the smoke out of the chimney. I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction. Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? prudent, and he shall know them?[151]

The prophet uses allusions to historical and literary references in a logical and forceful way. From the books of Genesis, Joshua, and Judges, he draws historical incidents which he feels are worthy of note, including the story of Jacob (12:3, 4, 12), wanderings in the wilderness (13:5), the Exodus (12:9, 13), the destruction of Sodom and other cities (11:8), Achor (2:15), Gibeah (10:9), and Ball-poer (9:10). These incidents remind the people of their heritage, and of the authority Jehovah has exerted in past centuries. The prophet also makes the following literary allusions, paralleling idiom and language of the Pentateuch:

whoredoms (Hosea 1:2 and Leviticus 20:5).
Children of Israel as sand of sea (Hosea 1:10 and Genesis 22:17; 32:12).
Israel, my son (Hosea 11:1 and Exodus 4:22).
Baalim removed and forgotten (Hosea 2:17 and Exodus 23:13).
eat and not have enough (Hosea 4:10 and Leviticus 26:26).
go with flocks and herds to seek God (Hosea 5:6 and Exodus 10:9).
"we shall live in His sight" (Hosea 6:2 and Genesis 17:18).
eat up the sin offering of My people (Hosea 4:8 and Leviticus 6:17).
the Lord is a memorial (Hosea 12:5 and Exodus 3:15).
made to dwell in tabernacles (Hosea 12:9 and Leviticus 23:43).
Israel found in the wilderness (Hosea 9:10 and Deuteronomy 32:10).
"Bread for mourners" (Hosea 4:4 and Deuteronomy 26:14).
return to Egypt (Hosea 8:13 and Deuteronomy 28:68).

Imagery makes for both vividness and clarity,[152] and makes a strong demand upon attention. "A concrete idea is more vivid."[153] "Vividness, created by copious use of imagery, has as one of its main values, the holding of attention and interest."[154] The variations in imagery which Hosea uses, increase the forcefulness of his message, and heighten interest. Many of the images are neither expanded nor explained, yet in their brevity they form a concrete composite of the people of Israel. The prophet presents familiar images of working, cooking, eating, drinking, hunting, worshipping, home and family life, but all of these are presented to picture the lack of knowledge or willful transgression of a nation once obedient.

Of the prophet's 98 visual images, we find included:

> beasts; fowls of heaven; creeping things; fishes of the sea; bird; eagle; calf; a wild ass alone by himself; horses; mountains; poplars; elms; morning; rain; morning cloud; early dew; a pleasant place; foam on the water; grow as the lily; green fir tree; branches spread; revive as the corn; grow as the vine; graven images; jewels; face; head; breasts; naked; gray hairs here and there; wilderness; forest; valley; sacrifice.

Examples of his 46 auditory imagery include:

> spake trembling; call; sing; swearing; lying; reprove; counsel; tumult; God said; I will hear; earth shall hear; hear the word of the Lord; blow the cornet; cry aloud; testify; trumpet; howled; making a covenant; speak comfortably; roar like a lion.

Olfactory images refer to "burnt offerings; scent as the wine of Lebanon; rottenness; incense; burn incense." Such imagery is not frequently employed. More tactual imagery can be found. Below are a few of Hosea's 34 tactual images:

> kiss; tear; bind us up; taking them by the arm; drew them with cords; take off the yoke; tremble as a bird; took by the heel; gathered together; joined; wind hath bound her up in her wings; torn; smitten; wool; thorns; nettles; thistle; fire; hot; heated; decked herself.

The gustatory imagery of Hosea is diverse; of his 55 images of taste, perhaps these are most suggestive:

> sour; thy mouth; eat flesh; eat unclean things; laid meat unto them; grapes in the wilderness; swallow it up; feast days; thirst; drink; water; bread; eat and not have enough; corn; wine; oil; devour like a lion.

Hosea employs 129 kinesthetic images which add to the emotional impact of his message. For example:

> lie down safely; lie in wait; spread my net; sleepeth all night; take; battle; go after; follow; fled; fly away; fled from me; fall; strive; turn; break the bow; strip; overtake; bring; break the sword; measured; stealing; slideth; raise us up; hewed them; bring them down; walked; assemble; buildeth temples; break down altars; cast off; workmen made it; gather them up; drive them out; wanders; ride; blow; break clods; ride upon horses; kept sheep; oil is carried; pour out My wrath; make a wall; wait on God.

Organic images common to the experience of mankind are seemingly most popular with Hosea. He uses this type of imagery 234 times. Some of these images follow:

> mirth; mourn; desolate; languish; slay; heal; cure; wound; fear; killing; revive us; slain; redeem from death; plagues; infants dashed in pieces; loves to oppress; provoked to anger most bitterly; anger turned away; receive graciously; hatred in the house; pleasure; joy; sorrow; strengthened; friend; sorrows of travailing woman; died; execute the fierceness of mine anger; how shall I give thee up; my heart is turned within Me; repentings are kindled together; go love; beloved; remembered; harlot; lovers; whoredom; born; weaned; wife; mother; husband; children; brothers; sisters; take away the heart; understand; shame; ashamed; love; imagine mischief; fatherless find mercy.

Hosea is wise in his use of much imagery, since suggestion leads the audience to accept, more or less, uncritically, the opinions and wishes of the speaker.[155] One of the chief characteristics of every crowd is that it thinks in a form of images which of necessity results in emotions.[156] Human emotions are always awakened by strong forms of imagery, and no orator can sway the individuals of a crowd who does not succeed in stirring their emotions.[157]

Hosea's figures of speech based upon daily occurrences may lack great original intensity, but their frequency forms a basis of sufficient strength that a reference to a similar experience arouses or sustains the attention. His figures are largely taken from the out-of-door experiences of a country household, and relate to farming, grazing, hunting, baking, protecting from the elements, from disease, from wild beasts, and from unscrupulous men. Such figures of speech constitute an important element of his beauty and grace. Some of his passages reach the level which frequently has been called the sublime style in rhetoric. The following are only a few examples of the figurative speech used throughout his messages:

> Ephraim also is like a silly dove without heart; When they shall go, I will spread my net upon them; I will bring them down as the fowls of the heaven; For they have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind: It hath no stalk: the bud shall yield no meal; if so be it yield, the strangers shall swallow it up. Ephraim is an heifer that is taught, and loveth to tread out the corn; but I passed over her fair neck: I will make Ephraim to ride; Judah shall plow, and Jacob shall break his clods. Sow to yourselves in righteousness, reap in mercy; Break up your fallow ground; for it is time to seek the Lord, till He come and rain righteous-

> ness upon you. Ye have plowed wickedness, ye have reaped iniquity; Ye have eaten the fruit of lies; An east wind of the Lord shall come up from the wilderness, and his spring shall become dry.[158]

Hosea uses more similes and metaphors than any other Old Testament writer.[159] The last part of his book especially abounds with "skillfully devised figures of speech."[160] These are effective and elevating, although the accumulations of unexplained and isolated figures tend to obscurity.[161] Among his 71 similes are the following suggestive ones:

> like a silly dove; as the fowls of the heaven; like a deceitful bow; as an eagle; as a vessel; as a strange thing; as other people; as the bread of mourners; as the sand of the sea; as a wilderness; like a dry land; as a flaming fire; like people; like priest; as hemlock; as the foam upon the water; as an heifer that is taught; as they that take off the yoke; as the dew; as a backsliding heifer; like them that remove the bounds; like water; as a moth; as a lion; as a young lion; as the morning; as a morning cloud; as the latter and former rain; as the light that goeth forth; grow as the lily; as the olive tree; as Lebanon; revive as the corn; grow as the vine; scent as the wine of Lebanon; like a green fir tree; like men; as troops of robbers; as an oven heated; like grapes in the wilderness.

The prophet's 112 metaphors seem even more forceful. It is difficult to pick out the most picturesque, but they include the following:

> blood toucheth blood; joined to idols; a net spread; covenant with the beasts of the field; break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the earth; the land hath committed great whoredom; departing from the Lord; betroth thee to me forever; hedge up thy way; valley of achor for a door of Hope; earth shall hear the corn and the wine and the oil; Judah saw his wound; hewed them by the prophets; slain them by the words of my mouth; devoured their judges; a cake not turned; I have found and strengthened their arms; sown the wind; reap the whirlwind; Israel is swallowed up; a wild ass alone by

> himself; hired lovers; the prophet is a snare; their root is dried up; an empty vine; consume his branches and devour them; sow to yourselves in righteousness; break up your fallow ground; Ephraim feedeth on wind; followeth after the east wind; iniquity is bound up; an unwise son; his branches shall spread; dwell under his shadow.

Hosea's use of words similar in sound, but differing in meaning (paranomasias), include altars in Gilgal as "gallim" (heaps of stones), and "Bethel has become Beth-aven:" That is, "the house of God" has become "the house of vanity."[162] Assonance adds poetic beauty: "She shall follow . . . shall not overtake . . . she shall seek . . . shall not find . . . shall she say; "without a king . . . prince . . . image"; "Hear ye, hearken ye, give ye ear"; "Egypt shall gather them; Memphis shall bury them; nettles shall possess them"; "I will drive them out of mine house."[163] Personification adds interest and forcefulness: "Their staff declareth unto them; the wind hath bound her up in her wings; the pride of Israel doth testify to his face; thy calf hath cast thee off; say to the hills; Fall on us; make Ephraim to ride; Jacob shall break his clods; When Israel was a child; I called my son; I taught Ephraim to go; O grave, I will be thy destruction; O death, I will be thy plagues."

Hosea uses 16 rhetorical questions, all of them deeply suggestive and thought-provoking:

> O Ephraim, what shall I do unto thee?
> O Judah, what shall I do unto thee?
> How long will it be ere they attain to innocency?
> What will ye do in the solemn day,
> and in the day of the feast of the Lord?
> Give them, O Lord . . . what wilt thou give?

> What then should a king do to us?
> How shall I give thee up, Ephraim?
> How shall I deliver thee, Israel?
> How shall I make thee as Admah?
> How shall I set thee as Zeboim?
> Is there iniquity in Gilead?
> Where is there any other that may save thee?
> and thy judges of whom thou saidst, Give me a king and princes?
> Ephraim shall say, What have I to do any more with idols?
> Who is wise, and he shall understand these things?
> Prudent and he shall know them?

Progression in the messages of Hosea is a proceeding from cause to effect, or a tracing of effects back to their cause. As a whole, the prophet appears to repeatedly lead his audience in a series of small circles from sin to resultant judgment, and then sometimes on to a somewhat obscure statement of repentance and forgiveness. Only in the first three verses of the final chapter goes he give a full-scale picture of the restoration which is to follow the nation's humble return to Jehovah. Examples of his progression follow:

> For they shall eat, and not have enough;
> they shall commit whoredom, and shall not increase;
> because they have left off to take heed to the Lord.
> They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains,
> and burn incense upon the hills,
> under oaks and poplars and elms,
> because the shadow thereof is good:
> Therefore your daughters shall commit whoredom,
> and your spouses shall commit adultery.
> . . . For I will be unto Ephraim as a lion,
> and as a young lion to the house of Judah:
> I, even I, will tear and go away;
> I will take away, and none shall rescue him.
> . . . Sow to yourselves in righteousness, reap
> in mercy; break up your fallow ground; for it is
> time to seek the Lord, till he come and rain
> righteousness upon you.
> Ye have plowed wickedness, ye have reaped iniquity;

> Ye have eaten the fruit of lies:
> because thou didst trust in thy way,
> in the multitude of thy mighty men;
> therefore shall a tumult arise among thy people,
> and all thy fortresses shall be spoiled,
> as Shalman spoiled Beth-arbel in the day of battle
> . . . So shall Bethel do unto you because of your
> great wickedness:[164]

Hosea has a sense of the dramatic. He uses suspense and climax vehemently, and is not as incoherent as first he appears. He creates suspense as he relates his marriage, the birth and significant naming of children, the adultery of Gomer and his provision for her while she lives with her lovers, then his unexpected forgiveness and invitation for her to return. Like a number of other prophets, he reserves his promises of restoration for the final chapter.

As has been noted under "Structure of the Sermons," the messages of Hosea do not systematically follow logical point after logical point in a neat pattern that rises to a final climax. Instead, accusation, threats, calamities, promises and climaxes are scattered throughout his speeches. Although his clearest promises of restoration are reserved for the end, and are a climax, there are equal climaxes to be found in at least seven other chapters.[165]

While imagery, universal figures, similes and metaphores abound in Hosea's speech, he uses asyndeton, the figure of speech which omits connectives, more frequently than any other Old Testament book. He is shocking, startling, passionate, abrupt, almost incoherent at times, but sincere. With strong emotion and eloquence he cries out for attention: Today is the day of choice--reconsider: Tomorrow is the day of calamity--repent and return!

Hosea expresses his versatility in the use of varied nouns, verbs, imagery, figures of speech, names, sentence structure, length, and form. This versatility is exemplified by the fact that the prophet's charges of infidelity to, and sin against, Jehovah are expressed in many different ways.

Such versatility is combined with intensity in Hosea's delivery. Personal experience, group experience, social mores, violations of trust, native desires and appeals to integrity combine to keep the audience attentive. Along with this variety of appeal, Hosea uses verbs as a major source of power in delivery. There are 637 verbs in the book, or almost an average of 4 verbs per verse. Chapter One has 44 verbs in 11 verses; Chapter Two has 91 verbs in 23 verses, an average of 4 verbs in each verse. The final chapter has 38 verbs in 9 verses, averaging over 4 verbs in each verse. In Chapters Four to Fourteen, 560 verbs average 3.5 verbs in each verse. These facts reveal the powerful thrust of Hosea's delivery. Illustrations seem to be selected primarily for their forcefulness rather than for their beauty, and personal pronouns create energy. Combined with 637 verbs, these give much power to Hosea's speeches.

An energetic delivery appears to be more important to Hosea than the matter of perspicuity. He assumes that a guilty nation will understand his emotion-laden utterance, and expects that a people previously informed can amplify and apply his imagery, even when it is fragmentary. Vehemence, vividness, versatility, and urgency are most important. He seems to understand that "vividness is the sine qua non of style."[166] Interest and attention are of great importance. However, form must be subordinated to purpose, for "form is always a means to an end--the impression desired upon the audience."[167] St. Augustine quotes Cicero regarding the need of a speaker to instruct, to please or interest, and to persuade, as we have noted, but then he adds that instruction depends upon content, while interest and persuasion rest upon style, or manner of delivery.[168] While Hosea's message is as vital as life itself, his first concern, then, must be style and delivery. He dare not rely on a vital message alone to seize and hold the attention of an unfriendly audience. In an "abrupt and emotional style,"[169] the prophet clamors for the attention of his apathetic countrymen. He speaks as one seeking sympathy, then turns quickly with staccato-like bursts to amplify and accuse. He invites, he threatens, he warns and pleads; he whispers, then weeps, then shouts of doom. He feels so deeply that he sees no need for explanation, rushing from one hasty sketch and one undeveloped thought to another. His illustrations are familiar but made doubly graphic by their personal nature, as he breathes into his impassioned words, "all the warmth and all the pain of an agonizing heart."[170] He can speak with insight and courage because his own domestic experience enables him to "perceive details and relations of fact not cognizable without such experience."[171] The victim of infidelity produces a profound and an enduring impression as he recites his story in the popular oriental poetic form.[172] He cannot put his agonizing heart into a plain style of delivery at all, but reveals versatility in delivery, as well as appropriateness to his own feelings, by moving between the moderate style with its attention-sustaining rhythm and ornamentation, and the grand style with its vehement emotions of the spirit.

His rhythm in speaking, on the whole, is inferior to that of Amos because of a halting, broken movement. However, some portions of Hosea's messages are considered by scholars to be equal to any part of the book of Amos.[173] Several isolated verses have unusual lyric beauty, and some have become proverbs, such as "like people, like priest,"[174] and "Sow the wind . . . reap the whirlwind."[175] The passage "whoredom and new wine take away the heart"[176] has been changed into "women and wine."[177] Longer passages in Hosea which are especially noted for their rhythm are found in the ninth and thirteenth chapters. Examples of these, in the moderate style, follow:

> Rejoice not, O Israel, for joy, as other people: for thou hast gone a whoring from thy God. . . . They shall not dwell in the Lord's land; but Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and they shall eat unclean things in Assyria.

> They shall not offer wine offerings to the Lord, neither shall they be pleasing unto Him; their sacrifice shall be unto them as the bread of mourners; . . . What will ye do in the solemn day, and in the day of the feast of the Lord? For, lo, they are gone because of destruction; Egypt shall gather them up, Memphis shall bury them; the pleasant places for their silver, nettles shall possess them: thorns shall be in their tabernacles. The days of visitation are come, the days of recompence are come; Israel shall know it: The prophet is a fool, the spiritual man is mad, for the multitude of thine iniquity, and the great hatred. The watchman of Ephraim was with my God: But the prophet . . . is hated in the house of his God. Therefore they shall be as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that passeth away, as the chaff that is driven with the whirlwind out of the floor, and as the smoke out of the chimney.[178]

Hosea rises to a grand style as he considers Israel's sin which takes its character from the exalted relationship with God into which she had been brought. In the voice of Jehovah he cries:

> Yet I am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt, and thou shalt know no god but Me: for there is no saviour beside Me. I did know thee in the wilderness, in the land of great drought. According to their pasture so were they filled: they were filled, and their heart was exalted; therefore have they forgotten Me. . . . O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in Me is thine help![179]

Analysis of Pathos and Ethos

Aristotle (4th century B.C.), "the master of those who know," has exerted considerable influence upon the traditions and practices of persuasive speaking since his day, by his list of fifteen principal emotions or moods for possible use by persuasive speakers. It is interesting to note that he includes anger, placability, love, hatred, fear, confidence, shame, shamelessness, benevolence, selfishness, compassion, indignation, envy, emulation, and contempt.[180]

Cicero, in *De Inventione*, copied out the 15 methods of arousing indignation and the 16 of arousing pity, etc., but his main emphasis in *De Oratore* was the necessity for the *orator* to *feel* the emotions he tries to arouse. Hosea himself is deeply impressed with all the emotions he seeks to arouse in his audience, and seems to feel, as Cicero did, that men's judgments are more often formed under the influence of some emotion than by truth or principles of justice.[181] Thus, Hosea gives special emphasis to the rhetorical appeal to pathos, success in which, according to Cicero, constitutes the chief excellence of the orator.[182]

Interestingly, Hosea, in his persuasive appeals, uses at least 11 of the 15 emotions discussed by Aristotle and Cicero. *Anger* is aroused by his bold, blunt accusations and charges. He appeals to *love* of home, family, cities, and homeland. *Fear* of famine, of punishment, of captivity, or dispersion, of desertion by God, of death, and of destruction is strongly appealed to by the fiery prophet. He calls for confidence in God and His promises and in the future with its possibility and promise of restoration and plenty. The people are *shamed* by their gross ingratitude, lack of knowledge, false worship, degradation, and by the charge of being "deeply corrupted." The *selfish* interests of the audience are subtilly appealed to by stress upon their happiness and welfare, present and future. Their *pity* and *com-*

passion are elicited by the tragic domestic episode of the prophet and by the revelation of a Divine Father and Husband of the land whose tender heart is vitally concerned with the welfare of His erring children and adulterous people. The audience's indignation is aroused toward an unfaithful wife who spurns a loving husband and neglects her pleading children. An appeal to envy is made when Israel is reminded that she cannot rejoice for joy as other people do, for the days of visitation are come. The people are called upon to emulate Jacob, who, by his strength, had power with God, and Judah is cited as an example for calf-worshipping Israel to follow in the worship of Jehovah. Contempt for their idols and their pagan immorality is generated by showing the folly of idolatry, and idolatrous counsel, and the sorrowful fruit of their wicked practices.

> The prophet, from beginning to end, has in mind the hopeless condition of his people; he exhorts, laments, warns, pleads, denounces, promises--in fact, uses every possible method of persuasion--in order that he may win the people back to a pure and acceptable service of their God.[183]

Emotion is definitely the basis of persuasion for Hosea. He has had an emotional experience and he comes before his audience with an emotional message. The home of the prophet, broken by infidelity, might have been the home of his listeners. The unfaithful spouse of the prophet might have been the wife of their own bosom, the mother of their own children. The pleading children might have been their own offspring. Marriage, home, and children are the common experience of the audience, but Hosea introduces new elements into an old story.[184]

Although love, as such, was not a necessary accompaniment of marriage in the olden times, here is a husband with love--with a love of sufficient strength to forgive and to forget. God's feeling is seen as similar to that of an affectionate husband and father. When an interpreter is needed, the children take the message of a loving husband to the estranged wife and mother. So, too, the prophet brings the merciful message of a loving Lord to an estranged people, and makes arrangements for their return and a happy reconciliation. Like Paul, and unlike Cicero, Hosea has no place for humor as he relates his words to the vital interests of the individuals in his audience, and appeals to them for an active response. He insists that his recommended course of action will avoid pain and create pleasurable anticipation. Thirty-six verses are positive appeals based upon faith, and 162 verses are negative appeals based upon fear. In their order of frequency, the prophet appeals to the emotions of guilt, insecurity, self-preservation from suffering and destruction, contentment of well-being, indignation, integrity, compassion, and reputation.

In 74 verses appealing to the conscience of the people, Hosea presents their ingratitude and guilt. Examples follow:

> For the Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth nor mercy, nor

> knowledge of God in the land. By swearing and lying . . . killing . . . committing adultery . . . iniquity . . . whoredom . . . they have left off to take heed to the Lord. Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart. My people ask counsel at their stocks . . . their staff . . . for the spirit of whoredoms hath caused them to err, and they have gone a whoring from under their God. They sacrifice with harlots. Israel slideth back as a backsliding heifer; Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone. They shall be ashamed because of their sacrifices. For she did not know that I gave her corn, and wine, and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold. Though I have redeemed them . . . they have spoken lies against me; Though I have bound and strengthened their arms, yet do they imagine mischief against Me.[185]

Hosea's threatenings of judgment seek to arouse in his people, at least 38 times, a great sense of insecurity without their God, Jehovah. Powerful illustrations of these passages include:

> They shall go with their flocks and with their herds to seek the Lord; but they shall not find Him; He hath withdrawn Himself from them. They sacrifice flesh for the sacrifices of Mine offerings, and eat it; but the Lord accepteth them not; now will He remember their iniquity, and visit their sins; They shall return to Egypt. I will send a fire upon his cities . . . I will drive them out of mine house. I will love them no more. My God will cast them away, because they did not hearken unto Him: and they shall be wanderers among the nations. He shall roar like a lion: then the children shall tremble. Asshur shall not save us; we will not ride upon horses; neither will we say any more to the work of our hands, ye are our gods: for in Thee the fatherless findeth mercy.[186]

Continued disobedience is threatened by the most severe punishments. Suffering, desolation, destruction, and death are said to be penalty for persistent infidelity and immorality. Self-destruction is but another word for self-indulgence. Hosea gives 33 appeals to self-preservation from suffering and death.

> All thy fortresses shall be spoiled.
> The sword shall abide on his cities.
> (God) will meet them as a bear that is bereaved of her
>   whelps, and will rend them.
> He will devour them like a lion: the wild beast
> shall tear them. The sorrows of a travailing woman
> shall come. They shall fall by the sword:
> their infants shall be dashed in pieces, and
> their women with child shall be ripped up.
> Therefore shall the land mourn, and everyone
> that dwelleth therein shall languish;
> Ephraim shall be desolate in the day of rebuke;
> when Ephraim saw his sickness and Judah saw his
> wound, then went Ephraim to the Assyrian, and sent
> to king Jareb: yet could he not heal thee because
> thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject
> thee. I will also forget thy children.
> Now shall they be among the Gentiles as avessel
> wherein is no pleasure. Though they bring up
> their children, yet will I bereave them.
> And they shall say to the mountains, Cover us;
> and to the hills, Fall on us.
> As they were increased, so they sinned against Me;
> therefore will I change their glory into shame.[187]

Hope of survival is seen to depend upon divine intervention. Divine intervention is declared to be dependent upon individual response to the prophetic warning. Self-preservation is possible, but it is limited to one possibility. There must be repentance and a returning to God. There must be a favorable response to the prophet who declares the word of the Lord: "for there is no Savior beside Me."[188]

Hosea's appeals to desires for contentment and well-being are based upon faith in the promises of God:

> I will make a covenant with them . . . and make them to lie down safely, and I will betroth thee unto Me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in lovingkindness, and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto Me in faithfulness, and thou shalt know the Lord. I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy, and I will say to them which were not My people, Thou art My

> people; and they shall say, Thou art my God. Come, and let us return unto the Lord: for He hath torn, and He will heal us; and hath smitten, and He will bind us up. And he shall come to us as the rain. . . . I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely: I will be as the dew unto Israel: He shall grow as the lily, and cast forth his roots as Lebanon. His branches shall spread, and his beauty shall be as the olive tree.[189]

Hosea appeals to the indignation of the audience as he presents the viewpoint of the forsaken husband. The listeners become more and more indignant as he progresses. However, that Israel is the adulterous wife of Jehovah now justly disowned, becomes his clear teaching as he proclaims "saith the Lord" at the conclusion of 12 verses used to rouse this indignation.

> She is not my wife, neither am I her husband: let her therefore put away her whoredoms out of her sight, and her adulteries from between her breasts; Lest I strip her naked, and set her as in the day that she was born, . . . make her as a wilderness . . . like a dry land, and slay her with thirst. And I will not have mercy upon her children; . . . she that conceived them hath done shamefully: for she said, I will go after my lovers that give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, mine oil and my drink. Therefore, behold, I will hedge up thy way with thorns, and make a wall, that she shall not find her paths. And she shall follow after her lovers, but she shall not overtake them; then shall she say, I will go and return to my first husband, for then was it better with me than now. For she did not know that I gave her corn . . . wine . . . oil, and multiplied her silver and gold, which they prepared for Baal. Therefore will I return, and take away my corn . . . wine . . . wool . . . flax . . . and now will I discover her lewdness in the sight of her lovers . . . I will also cause all her mirth to cease . . . and I will destroy her vines and her fig trees, whereof she hath said, These are my rewards that my lovers have given me: and I will make them a forest, and the beasts of the field shall eat them . . . and she decked herself with her earrings and her jewels, and she went after her lovers, and forgot me, saith the Lord.[190]

In his appeals to integrity, Hosea contrasts the integrity of God with that of Israel, and with their father, Jacob, who had power with God. Following are the 10 verses which the prophet devotes to this topic:

> Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and His goodness in the latter days. For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings. But they like men have transgressed the covenant: there have they dealt treacherously against me. How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee, Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zeboim? Mine heart is turned within Me, My repentings are kindled together. I will not execute the fierceness of Mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim: for I am God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee: and I will not enter into the city. He took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his strength he had power with God: Yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed: he wept, and made supplication unto Him: He found him in Bethel, and there He spake with us; Even the Lord of hosts; the Lord is his memorial. Therefore turn thou to thy God: keep mercy and judgment, and wait on thy God continually . . . Who is wise, and he shall understand these things: prudent, and he shall know them: for the ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them: but the transgressors shall fall therein.[191]

Compassion is an emotion which Hosea himself has experienced deeply, one which the prophets Amos and Micah do not touch, and one which surprises the audience who have just been made indignant with the adulterous wife. Here is exemplified and presented the compassion of God which leads to repentance:

> Plead . . . plead . . . I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and speak comfortably unto her, and give her vineyards and the valley of Achor for a door of hope; and she shall sing there as in the days of her youth, as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt. And it shall be at that day, saith the

> Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi [my husband] and shalt call me no more Baali [my lord]. I taught Ephraim also to go . . . taking them by their arms; . . . I healed them. I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love: and I was to them as they that take off the yoke on their jaws, and I laid meat before them. O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in Me is thy help.[192]

The universal desire for property which "is one of the greatest incentives to action"[193] forms a basis for action in the prophet's message. The appeal which emphasizes the desire for goods, lands, and money--wealth in general and therefore good reputation, is employed as a device to impel proper behavior. Vineyards and fig trees are threatened with destruction,[194] but the return of prosperity is promised for those who will return to the Lord: "They shall revive as the corn, and grow as the vine."[195] "From Me is thy fruit found."[196]

Hosea's appeal to a good reputation includes more than the possession of property, however; it also includes the desire for power: "The desire to possess skill, force, energy, along every line of endeavor, the ability to be and to do. All normal persons seek the esteem and regard of mankind; the desire for the good opinion and good will of others is born of self-respect and pride."[197] The Lord threatens to "cause to cease the kingdom of the house of Israel,"[198] but those who return unto the Lord are promised national success and an exalted reputation:

> Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not My people,

> there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God. Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land: for great shall be the day of Jezreel. They that dwell under his shadow shall return; they shall revive as the corn, and grow as the vine; the scent thereof shall be as the wine of Lebanon.[199]

Hosea makes no apology for his pathos. He senses that "In practical argument we cannot ignore the part of emotion in determining belief."[200] St. Augustine comments that, "men have the liberty of doing or not doing the things they know,"[201] and if the facts have been learned, and although they know what they ought to do, they do not do it, there is need for "greater power of eloquence,"[202] and a grand style of speaking "rendered passionate by the heart's emotions"[203] and "in a manner adapted to move their hearts."[204]

The essential relationship of pathos to all persuasion emphasized by Augustine seems to fit perfectly the emotional appeals and purpose of Hosea:

> Moreover, as a listener must be pleased if his attention is to be held, so he must be persuaded if he is to be moved to action. And as he is pleased if you speak attractively, so he is persuaded if he likes what you promise, fears what you threaten, hates what you censure, embraces what you command, grieves over what you emphasize as deserving of grief, rejoices when you say something should gladden, sympathizes with those whom you by your words set before his eyes as objects of pity, shuns those whom you with threats consider ought to be avoided--and so on in regard to whatever else in the way of moving the hearts of the audience is possible through powerful eloquence, not that they may know what they must do, but that they may do what they already know they ought to do.[205]

Emotional appeals have their greatest effectiveness when a heightened state of suggestibility has been created,[206] and there is "a felt community of experience and purpose."[207] As Troland states, this willingness to obey another is achieved by suggestibility which is induced by fear of ill consequences or promise of benefit.[208] Such emotional appeal, which constitutes the prophet's outstanding strength, is accomplished by the choice of emotional words, emotional content or subject matter, a literary form which arouses emotion, and by emotional argument directed to impelling motives by a man who is obviously experiencing such emotion himself. The prophet's appeals include a consistent and well-distributed emphasis upon emotions from fear and hatred to love and hope.

The _ethos_ of Hosea is perhaps more easily recognized than the character of any other Old Testament prophet because he reveals so much of his own personal life and feelings. He is unselfish even to the point of being wholly self-sacrificing, for he is willing to bare his own soul and private life, the rejection and shame he has experienced, in order that God's people may recognize their own sin of rejecting Jehovah, and be reconciled to Him. It is with a shocking, intimate style that the prophet lays bare the bleeding wound of his own heart.

Hosea is also obedient, as well as unselfish, yielding to the authority and command of Jehovah: "Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms."[209]

The prophet reveals courage when he rises to challenge the accepted behavior of his day, especially in a day when the prophet of Jehovah is hated. Hosea stands alone, vulnerable to the vengeance of roaming bandits, the revolutionists, the pro-Assyrian and pro-Egyptian parties, the monarchists and the nationalists. He aligns himself with no one but God. In this he reminds us of the first prophet of Christianity when Paul tells Timothy, "At my first answer no man stood with me . . . notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all . . . might hear."[210]

The integrity and honor of Hosea demand that moral laws and Israel's covenant with God be kept. He is a faithful witness to the faithfulness and love of Jehovah, and cannot understand the rebellion of a nation chosen of God.

In the same manner, Hosea's own love for Gomer remains faithful, though it stuns the audience about him, for he sees and knows a heavenly vision of Love: love that outlasts all that is hurled against it. The prophet's love for Gomer, and his purchase of the adulteress for the price of a slave, instead of stoning her publicly, is something most of his Hebrew brethren cannot understand. But Hosea is not motivated by cultural mores; he is guided by the assurance of God's love for all, and willingness to forgive, and by the knowledge that his own life is to exemplify that willingness. By the Spirit of Jehovah Hosea himself becomes Love.

Augustine insists: "The life of the speaker has greater force to make him persuasive than the grandeur of his eloquence, however great that may be."[211] Beecher's succinct statement says, "Let no sneak try to be an Orator."[212] The sincerity and true love of Hosea's character is expressed by the entire family story. "The depth of his affection, the gentleness which characterized it, and likewise the passion, of which a glimpse is now and then obtained, all point to a personality unique in Old Testament history."[213] Hosea has a vision of "the loving heart of Jehovah grieving over His erring children."[214] The only way Hosea could reveal the true nature of God was to present a drama of God's love for Israel. The prophet could reveal a knowledge of God in his preaching message, because the drama which preceded his ministry was so vivid and true.

> The words of Amos sound like a voice from outside, pealing with thunder of God's anger and righteous indignation against wrongs and injuries that Amos himself does not feel bound up with. The characteristic of Hosea's book is that the burden of Israel's guilt lies weighty on his soul; he wails and mourns, and laments, and repents with the sinful people. He almost expresses the vicarious involvement in their guilt and carrying of their sorrows.[215]

First, Hosea's message to Israel, which he recognized as God's message, had become incarnated in his own life. Though a prophet is inspired by God, it does not follow that his individuality is taken away. True prophets bubbled over with divine wisdom, but they presented it in their own peculiar ways. With Hosea it was a little different. His inspiration did not come as did Amos' when God intervened to send him to Bethel. Hosea was inspired by his experience, which he felt God had directed. The message which he felt inspired to bring to the people could be presented only by one who had suffered vicariously and thereby had entered into God's suffering. He could tell of the love of God because it had come to full expression (as full as possible with man), when he conquered, "pride and all sense of injury done him, and found the woman who had once been his wife, bought her from slavery into which she had fallen, and restored her to the calm and the love of his home, where he hoped that in time she might grow, under the discipline of love and patience, to be worthy once more of the name of wife."[216] Since his experience so closely paralleled God's experience with Israel, Hosea used God's technique in preaching to his congregation.

Mercy is an outstanding attribute of the prophet, for like Jehovah, he believes in reconciliation for the repentant. Love is eager to restore the returning loved one. Hosea wants to do this for Gomer, and he believes God is longing to receive back His people, for in Him "the fatherless find mercy."[217]

Hosea also reveals spiritual maturity, for he has his eyes on eternal values, not on temporal things. He recognizes that physical indulgence is not worth spiritual loss. Restlessness that results from moral collapse is only the beginning of self-destruction.

Knowledge, both spiritual and temporal, is displayed by the prophet. To him, knowledge of right brings responsibility to do right, and the knowledge of God is a treasure worth guarding, Whom to know is life eternal.[218] "Knowledge" (used 5 times), "know" (used 15 times), and "understanding" (used 4 times), are key words in his messages. The lack of understanding and knowledge is seen as the cause of immorality. "My people are destroyed for the lack of knowledge: because thou has rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee . . . for I desired mercy and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings."[219] Hosea also reveals the ability to use knowledge, such as that of the literature and tradition of Israel. He repeatedly refers to this history of Israel in his messages.

Hosea is obviously a man of great faith. It is faith in the goodness and love of God that causes him to embrace God's will for himself, no matter what the cost. By faith, he willingly takes a wife of whoredoms, believing that God will use his obedience for good. It is faith that prophesies Israel's restoration.

Hosea's actions require not only faith, but strength. He is strong enough to sacrifice himself for his people, and then to speak out, rebuking them for sin that has become culturally acceptable. His strength of character shines through his words. He is seen as a man not of strength only, but "endurance under incalculable agony."[220] "The orator is a leader, and weaklings do not lead."[221] Emerson says, "If I should make the shortest list of the qualifications of the orator, I should begin with manliness."[222] The character of Hosea is fundamentally "the Israelitish character, viz., strong, complex, emotional, religious,"[223] and these characteristics along with his extreme sincerity and earnestness unite to strongly urge the acceptance of his message.

Hosea displays wisdom as well as knowledge to his people, for he attacks not the symptoms only, but the very root of their problem. Israel has gone a-whoring from her God. Thus, the prophet is seen with "contending and conflicting feelings of tenderness side by side with indignation, of love and hate commingled, of leniency passing swiftly into severity and the reverse."[224] Because Hosea knows that God is just and cannot ignore Israel's adultery, his hope for the future sometimes turns into an almost absolute despair.

The prophet is open, frank, and plain in his denunciation of unholiness and his upholding of holiness. He uses no euphemisms in his description of his children's pleading with their harlot mother to put away "her adulteries from between her breasts,"[225] or in threatening to "strip her naked"[226] as a public example, or in denouncing her conceptions accomplished shamefully.[227] For Hosea, religion and true life mean walking before God, in the light of his love and holiness. All action, attitude, thought and purpose come under scrutiny. People, priests, and rulers conform to the righteousness of Jehovah. No one escapes the standard and each receives, according to his works, the blessing or the curse.

Hosea speaks with authority. He speaks with the authority of his own God-guided experience, and by the authority of his speaking in the Person and as the Voice of Jehovah. He speaks in the first person 207 times, repeatedly revealing Deity as the source of his authority, and variously emphasizing the vital nature of his message. Some 65 times he makes reference to Jehovah, using 13 different name combinations in a desperate endeavor to show the weight of his appeals. Hosea assumes not only that God can and does talk to His people, but that He can talk to them in the first person through His prophet.[228] There are a few places in Hosea, especially in the first three chapters, which use the introduction, "And the Lord said . . . And God said . . . ,"[229] but beginning in Chapter Four the message is presented thusly: "Hear the word of Jehovah, ye children of Israel; for Jehovah hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land."[230] Not only does Hosea assume that God can talk through him in the first person, but he expects the people to believe his assumption without explanation.

The appeal to authority is used because Hosea loves and because Jehovah loves. Amos and Hosea both, by presupposition, attribute to God's nature the element of jealousy.

This is seen more clearly in Hosea, but that might serve as reason to say that the jealousy of God is more of an assumption with Amos. One verse in Hosea, more than any other, assumes the jealousy of God: "Yet I am Jehovah thy God from the land of Egypt: and thou shalt know no god but Me, and besides Me there is no Savior."[231] Jehovah calls Himself a "jealous God"[232] because love itself is possessive and protective, though unselfishly concerned. Love exerts authority over the beloved for the welfare of the beloved. Because Jehovah loves His people He appeals to their wills, in order to protect them from all future ill and to give them communion with Himself. When they return to Him as a people, then they will also have fellowship with one another, based upon the highest ethical-love relationship.

The ethos of Hosea as a speaker, as far as his audience is concerned, is no doubt aided by the fact that he proclaims the word of Jehovah for 60 to 65 years. Yet no doubt many among his listeners still wonder about the intelligence and character of a man who will let an adulteress in their society go unpunished. Other skeptics will not recognize the compassion or goodwill of the prophet beneath the severity of his controversy with idolatrous Israel. Perhaps the greatest witness to the sincerity and goodness of Hosea is the fact that, in the eyes of his audience, there can be no personal gain, material, mental, or even spiritual, for a

EXTRA 100% RAG

prophet who continuously proclaims such a message to such a people.

Summary

Hosea, the son of Beeri, prophesies to the Northern Kingdom (Israel or Ephraim) during the time that Isaiah is prophesying in Judah. Hosea is the one writing prophet of the Northern Kingdom who addresses his own people. Brokenheartedly, he prophesies their impending exile which takes place in 722 B.C. Most of his prophetic ministry takes place from 750 to 725 B.C.

The book of Hosea reflects the prophet's tragic homelife after his marriage to faithless Gomer. His actions toward her parallel God's long-suffering dealings with Israel. After vowing faithfulness to the law of the Lord, Israel has gone lusting after Baal and the other gods of Canaan. Hosea's speeches are inspired by a knowledge of Jehovah's forgiving love which seeks His people's return to a faithful love-relationship with Him. The prophet is rightfully titled "The Prophet of Love" and "The Prophet of Repentance."

The theme of the prophet's message as a whole is, "O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God," for Jehovah's complaint is that His people lack knowledge; that is, they are ignorant of, and far from, God's heart of love and holiness which He longs to reproduce in them.

Hosea uses the strategy of surprise, gaining his listeners' sympathy before declaring his message which is appropriate to their idolatrous lives and the occasion of impending doom. His message is weak in formal logic or argument, however, for it appears that he has no logical plan of arrangement. Grammatical correctness is missing, for in his grief and vehemence Hosea is heedless of rules concerning forms and uses of words.

Perspicuity is evident in his speeches in that he shows an understanding of his main ideas, and selects discerning words. Sentence structure is complex, though, and his clarity is limited by his abundant figures, many of them uncompleted, by his fragmentary units, undeveloped references, and his intense emotion. He is remarkable for his obscurity through his manner of omitting connectives, and his abrupt, unexpected transitions. Direct discourse in his book creates forcefulness, but it does not contribute to perspicuity since he often fails to indicate change of speakers.

Hosea uses much ornamentation as an element of style. He includes analogy, example and illustration, balance or poetic parallelism, antithesis, repetition, allusion, imagery, and figures of speech, including similes and metaphors which he uses more than any other Old Testament writer. Often he accumulates them in the spirit of Hebrew poetry, so that many beautiful passages occur, some of them sublime. Nevertheless, his style is not considered by some scholars to be as fine or vigorous as that of Amos, nor his imagery as vivid.

Hosea's versatility is combined with intensity in his delivery. The prophet pours out his heart as he moves between the moderate and grand styles of speaking.

The motivations used by Hosea are logical, through the repetition of cause and effect; authoritative, as he speaks in the character and voice of Jehovah; ethical, as he presents his own tragic experience paralleling Israel's adultery; and emotional, being based on fear more often than faith. Pathos is definitely the chief basis of persuasion for Hosea. He already feels the emotions he tries to arouse in his audience. God's message has become incarnated in his own life. Passages of unsurpassed tenderness and harsh judgment are intermingled with each other to show God's feelings for His erring people. Through his self-exposing message, Hosea reveals himself to be reverently obedient and faithful, wise and knowledgeable, courageous and strong, loving and merciful.

The prophet makes no attempt to discover and appeal to the particular primary motives of his audience. He antagonizes them by recurring references to their disloyalty and infidelity, and by his words against the rulers and priests. Most of his congregation are so demoralized that his passionate pleas have no effect on them. Though his message is one of enduring and evocative import, beauty, and power, whether he was successful at all is not fully known.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Hosea 1:2; 7:5.

[2] Hosea 2:8, 9.

[3] Hosea 2:8.

[4] Hosea 7:6-8.

[5] Hosea 9:1, 2; 13:3.

[6] Hosea 1:2.

[7] Amos 1:2.

[8] Raymond Calkins, The Modern Message of the Minor Prophets (New York: Harper & Bros., 1947), pp. 33-36.

[9] Rolland E. Wolfe, Meet Amos and Hosea (New York: Harper & Bros., 1945), pp. 8-186.

[10] Hosea 9:10, 11; 14:10-15.

[11] Hosea 11:1, 3a, 4a.

[12] Hosea 1:2.

[13] John M. P. Smith, The Prophet and His Problem (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1914), p. 117.

[14] Acts 7:51-53; Deuteronomy 9:6, 7; Ezekial 2:4; Deuteronomy 31:27; II Chronicles 30:8.

[15] J. Frederic McCurdy, "Hosea," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, ed. Samuel MaCauley Jackson (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1909), V, p. 371.

[16] McCurdy, V, p. 371.

[17] Adam Clarke, The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments with a Commentary and Critical Notes (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1832), IV, p. 620.

[18] Clarke, IV, p. 620.

[19] Hosea 3:5; 5:12; 7:7-9; 8:4; 10:3; 13:10.

[20] Hosea 5:13; 7:10; 8:9; 12:1; 14:3.

[21] The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural Dictionary, ed. Samuel Fallows (Chicago: Howard-Severance Co., 1917), II, p. 830.

[22] Amos 7:4.

[23] II Kings 14:25.

[24] Wolfe, Meet Amos and Hosea, p. 98.

[25] Hosea 5:8-10.

[26] Hosea 4:2, 7, 11.

[27] G. L. Robinson, The Twelve Minor Prophets (New York: Harper & Bros., 1926), p. 17.

[28] Hosea 9:11, 14b

[29] Hosea 4:12-14.

[30] Charles F. Kent, The Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1915), p. 52.

[31] Hosea 4:1.

[32] Hosea 7:13c, 8:12, 9:17b.

[33] Hosea 13:6; 7:16a; 5:4.

[34] Hosea 4:14c; 3:6a.

[35] Hosea 4:6b, c.

[36] Hosea 8:7.

[37] John 8:1-11.

[38] Hosea 2:9. Further, the punishment of an adulteress among the ancient Germans was this: They shaved off her hair, stripped her naked in the presence of her relatives, and in this state, drove her from the house of her husband. Cf. Clarke, Commentary and Critical Notes, IV, p. 628, and also Isaiah 3:17 and Ezekial 16:39.

[39] Hosea 6:4; 11:8.

[40] J. Frederic McCurdy, "Hosea," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, V, p. 443.

[41] Deuteronomy 6:4. The Hebrew translation of "one" here means "one composite unity."

[42] Deuteronomy 6:4; 4:39.

[43] Amos 4:1.

[44] Hosea 8:5, 6.

[45] Hosea 7:3.

[46] Hosea 4:12, 13.

[47] Hosea 5:1; 10:8; 9:3; 9:6, 7; 6:6; 10:1, 2; 11:26.

[48] Hosea 13:2.

[49] Adam Clarke, Commentary and Critical Notes, IV, p. 650.

[50] Costen J. Harrell, The Prophets of Israel (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1933), p. 65.

[51] George Adam Smith, "The Book of the Twelve Prophets," The Expositor's Bible, ed. W. R. Nicholl (New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1905), I, p. 254.

[52] Hosea 14:9.

[53] Hosea 5:15; 6:1; 7:15, 16; 10:12; 11:1, 2a; 13:4-6; 14:1, 2, 8a.

[54] Hosea 5:15.

[55] Hosea 6:1, 3.

[56] George Adam Smith, "The Book of the Twelve Prophets," The Expositor's Bible, I, p. 325.

[57] Hosea 5:1.

[58] Hosea 14:1-3, 8a, 9.

[59] Hosea 14:9.

[60] Craig Baird, Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), p. 9.

[61] Baird, p. 9.

[62] Baird, p. 9.

[63] George Adam Smith, "The Book of the Twelve Prophets," The Expositor's Bible, I, p. 229.

[64] Hosea 4:1-19.

[65] Hosea 10:11-13.

[66] Hosea 6:7; 12:2; 8:14a.

[67] Hosea 6:6.

[68] Lewis B. Paton, Outline of a Course of Study for Advanced Classes on the Prophets of Israel and Their Writings (Hartford, Connecticut: Hartford Seminary Press, 1902), p. 11.

[69] Charles F. Pfeiffer and Everett F. Harrison, The Wycliffe Bible Commentary (Nashville: The Southwestern Company, 1962), p. 802.

[70] Exodus 20:5.

[71] Hosea 2:17, 19, 20, 23.

[72] Malachi 3:1-6.

[73] G. L. Robinson, The Twelve Minor Prophets, pp. 19-22.

[74] Raymond Calkins, The Modern Message of the Minor Prophets, pp. 39-41.

[75] Calkins, p. 41.

[76] Charles F. Kent, The Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets, p. 59.

[77] Rolland E. Wolfe, Meet Amos and Hosea, pp. 152-54.

[78] Raymond Calkins, The Modern Message of the Minor Prophets, p. 50.

[79] W. Robertson Smith, The Prophets of Israel (London: A. C. Black, 1897), p. 160.

[80] Hosea 4:8.

[81] Hosea 2:8; 6:3, 6; 2:20; 8:2; 11:3, 1, 4; 13:5; 14:8, 9.

[82] Charles F. Kent, The Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets, p. 53.

[83] Deuteronomy 6:4-9. Of the six commandments given by Jesus to the rich young man, five are the social laws of the Ten Commandments, and the other is not even in the Decalogue but is a summation of all social laws. Matthew 19:18, 19. Cf. also Matthew 5:43, 44.

[84] Leviticus 19:18, 34.

[85] Hosea 2:5, 8, 16; 3:1; 4:12-14, 17-19; 13:2.

[86] Hosea 8:4; 10:7; 13:11; 8:14; 13:4; 14:3.

[87] Hosea 8:9; 5:13; 7:11; 12:1.

[88] Hosea 13:9; Cf. also Hosea 5:13; 7:8, 10b, 11, 13a; 8:4a; 8:8-10, 14; 9:1; 12:1c; 13:16a.

[89] Hosea 7:1, 3, 4a, 7a.

[90] Hosea 4:1, 2; 5:1, 4; 6:8; 7;1, 5, 13; 10:4; 12:7, 8.

[91] Hosea 2:19, 20, 23.

[92] Matthew 9:10-12; and Matthew 12:1-8.

[93] James 1:27.

[94] Micah 6:8b.

[95] Cf. Isaiah, Chapter 53.

[96] Hosea 11:4.

[97] Hosea 14:4.

[98] Alan H. Monroe, Principles and Types of Speech (New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1935), p. 251.

[99] Floyd L. Ruch, Psychology and Life (Chicago: Scott Foresman & Co., 1948), p. 297.

[100] Leonard T. Troland, The Fundamentals of Human Motivation (Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1965), p. 443.

[101] Hosea 2:3.

[102] Hosea 2:3.

[103] Hosea 2:6.

[104] Hosea 2:9-12.

[105] Hosea 2:14, 15.

[106] Hosea 4:1.

[107] William P. Sandford and Willard H. Yeager, Principles of Effective Speaking (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1950), p. 142.

[108] Arthur E. Phillips, Effective Speaking (Chicago: The Newton Company, 1915), p. 48.

[109] Hosea 5:15a.

[110] Hosea 6:1.

[111] Hosea 4:6.

[112] Hosea 7:11.

[113] Hosea 1:4.

[114] Hosea 3:3-5; 9:14; 10:3-9; 13:9-11.

[115] Hosea 4:17; 5:4; 8:5, 6.

[116] William R. Harper, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea," The International Critical Commentary, ed. S. R. Driver, et al. (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. cl.

[117] Hosea 4:1ff.

[118] Hosea 4:6ff; 5:1ff.

[119] Hosea 4:6; 13:4; 6:6; 14:9.

[120] Lester Thonssen and Ross Scanlan, Speech Preparation and Delivery (Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1942), p. 119.

[121] Thonssen and Scanlan, p. 116.

[122] Thonssen and Scanlan, p. 117.

[123] James A. Winans, Public Speaking (New York: The Century Company, 1925), p. 259.

[124] Thonssen and Scanlan, Speech Preparation and Delivery, p. 119.

[125] Robert T. Oliver, The Psychology of Persuasive Speech (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1942), p. 175.

[126] F. W. Farrar, The Minor Prophets, pp. 70, 71.

[127] II Kings 15:19, 20.

[128] Wolfe, Meet Amos and Hosea, pp. 118, 119.

[129] Costen J. Harrell, The Prophets of Israel, p. 61.

[130] W. Robertson Smith, The Prophets of Israel, p. 157, also quoted by Harrell, p. 61.

[131] Hosea 13:16.

[132] Hosea 14:4.

[133] Hosea 14:9.

[134] Hosea 14:8a.

[135] Hosea 6:7.

[136] Hosea 7:11.

[137] Hosea 1:2.

[138] George Adam Smith, "The Book of the Twelve Prophets," The Expositor's Bible, p. 220.

[139] James Winans, Speech Making (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1938), p. 159.

[140] Frederick C. Eiselen, The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1923), II, pp. 363, 364.

[141] W. J. Deane, "Introduction to Hosea," The Pulpit Commentary, ed. Spence & Exell (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., n.d.), p. x.

[142] G. A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, I, p. 220.

[143] Brooks Peters Church, The Private Lives of the Prophets and the Times in Which They Lived (New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1953), pp. 87,88.

[144] John Paterson, The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1948), p. 51.

[145] James Winans, Speech Making, pp. 56, 113.

[146] Winans, p. 56.

[147] Winans, pp. 122-28.

[148] Rolland E. Wolfe, Meet Amos and Hosea, p. 152.

[149] Hosea 4:6; 6:1; 8:4a.

[150] Hosea 5:6; 8:14; 9:10; 11:4; 6:6, 7, 12; 9:3; 13:1-9; 14:9c,d.

[151] Hosea 4:1; 13:6; 12:2; 4:9b; 6:1; 7:9; 12:12; 13:3; 13:14; 14:9a,b.

[152] James Winans, Public Speaking, p. 113.

[153] Winans, p. 62.

[154] G. W. Gray and W. W. Braden, Public Speaking: Principles and Practice (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 416.

[155] Sandford and Yeager, Principles of Effective Speaking, pp. 205, 206.

[156] W. D. Scott, The Psychology of Public Speaking (Philadelphia: The Pearson Brothers, 1907), pp. 176, 77.

[157] Scott, pp. 183, 84.

[158] Hosea 7:11, 12; 8:7; 10:11-13; 13:15.

[159] Rolland E. Wolfe, Meet Amos and Hosea, p. 152.

[160] Wolfe, p. 152.

[161] W. J. Deane, "Introduction to Hosea," The Pulpit Commentary, p. x.

[162] Hosea 12:11 and 10:5.

[163] Hosea 2:7; 3:4; 5:1; 9:6, 15.

[164] Hosea 4:10, 13; 5:10, 11, 14, 15; 9:9; 10:12-15.

[165] Hosea 1:10, 11; 2:14-23; 3:5; 5:15-6:4; 11:9; 12:6; 13:14, 14:1-9

[166] William Norwood Brigance, *Speech Composition* (New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1937), p. 218.

[167] James A. Winans, *Public Speaking*, p. 109.

[168] Saint Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1958), Book IV, XXIII, p. 103.

[169] George Adam Smith, "The Book of the Twelve Prophets," *The Expositor's Bible*, I, p. 222.

[170] William R. Harper, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea," *The International Critical Commentary*, p. civi.

[171] John H. Wigmore, *The Science of Judicial Proof* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1937), p. 374.

[172] William R. Harper, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea," *The International Critical Commentary*, p. civi.

[173] Harper, p. clxxii.

[174] Hosea 4:9.

[175] Hosea 8:7.

17 [176] Hosea 4:11.

[177] William E. Orchard, *Oracles of God* (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1922), p. 82.

[178] Hosea 9:1, 3, 4, 5-8; 13:3.

[179] Hosea 13:4-6, 9.

[180] Aristotle, *Rhetoric and Poetics*, trans. Roberts and Bywater, ed. Friedrich Solmsen (New York: Random House, Inc., 1954), pp. 90-123.

[181] Cicero *De Oratore*, trans. E. W. Sutton, Loeb Classical Library, ed. James Loeb (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), II. 178.

[182] Cicero *Brutus*, trans. G. L. Hendrickson, Loeb Classical Library, ed. James Loeb (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 89, 279. Cf. *Orator*, trans. H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 128.

[183] Frederick E. Eiselen, The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament, II, p. 355.

[184] G. W. Gray and W. W. Braden, Public Speaking: Principles and Practice, p. 90.

[185] Hosea 4:1, 2, 10c, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19b; 2:8; 7:13, 15.

[186] Hosea 5:6; 8:13, 14c; 9:15, 17; 11:10; 14:3.

[187] Hosea 10:14; 11:6; 13:8; 13:13, 16; 4:3; 5:9, 13; 4:6; 8:8; 9:12; 10:8c; 4:7.

[188] Hosea 13:4.

[189] Hosea 2:18-20, 23; 6:1-3; 14:4-6.

[190] Hosea 2:2-13.

[191] Hosea 3:5; 6:6, 7; 11:8, 9; 12:3-6; 14:9.

[192] Hosea 2:2, 14-16; 11:3, 4; 13:9.

[193] Arthur E. Phillips, Effective Speaking, p. 50.

[194] Hosea 2:12.

[195] Hosea 14:7.

[196] Hosea 14:8.

[197] Arthur E. Phillips, Effective Speaking, pp. 51, 52.

[198] Hosea 1:4.

[199] Hosea 1:10, 11; 14:7.

[200] James A. Winans, Public Speaking, pp. 256, 257.

[201] Saint Augustine De Doctrina Christiana, Book IV, XXIII, p. 105.

[202] Saint Augustine, p. 105.

[203] Saint Augustine, p. 145.

[204] Saint Augustine, p. 129.

[205] Saint Augustine, p. 105.

[206] W. D. Scott, The Psychology of Public Speaking, pp. 173ff.

[207] W. D. Scott, p. 179.

[208] Leonard T. Troland, The Fundamentals of Human Motivation, p. 445.

[209] Hosea 1:2b.

[210] II Timothy 4:16, 17.

[211] Saint Augustine De Doctrina Christiana, Book IV, p. 181.

[212] James A. Winans, Public Speaking, p. 315.

[213] William R. Harper, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea," The International Critical Commentary, p. cxlv.

[214] H. P. Smith, Old Testament History, International Theological Library (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1909), p. 221.

[215] W. G. Jordan, Prophetic Ideas and Ideals(New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946), p. 28.

[216] Herbert L. Willett, The Prophets of Israel (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1899), p. 56.

[217] Hosea 14:3.

[218] John 17:3.

[219] Hosea 4:6 and 6:6.

[220] William R. Harper, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea," The International Critical Commentary, p. cxlv.

[221] James A. Winans, Public Speaking, p. 315.

[222] James A. Winans, p. 35.

[223] William R. Herper, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea," The International Critical Commentary, p. cxlv.

[224] William R. Harper, p. cxlv.

[225] Hosea 2:2.

[226] Hosea 2:3.

[227] Hosea 2:4.

[228] e.g., Hosea 9:10-13.

[229] Hosea 1:2, 3, 9.

[230] Hosea 4:1a.

[231] Hosea 13:4.

[232] Exodus 20:5.

CHAPTER VII

THE RHETORIC OF SAINT PAUL IN ACTS 20

Paul was sailing to Jerusalem with money that had been collected for the church of that city, but a dark cloud hovered over him, for he sensed that danger and perhaps even death were waiting for him in Jerusalem. This uncertainty, together with the affectionate remembrance of those among whom he had labored, led to the sermon he preached to the Christians at Miletus before he went on to the City of David.

In this sermon, found in Acts 20, we seem to have the clearest insight into the character and life of the Apostle Paul, and the workings of his mind and heart. Here we see his personality, his high moral and religious spirit, his self-sacrificing devotion to the welfare of his converts, and the honorable principles which governed his conduct.

Alford sees more of Paul in the sermon at Miletus than in any of the other speeches. The discourse to the Ephesian elders, he believes, "is a rich storehouse of phrases and sentiments peculiar to Paul . . . very faint traces are found of the hand of Luke."[1] Other critics have chosen to attack the speech as un-Pauline and a spurious invention by

Luke. However, such criticism is not the entire consensus of opinion, for equally as many pronounce the speech genuine.[2]

Barnes says of this sermon, "The discourse which follows is one of the most tender, affectionate, and eloquent which is anywhere to be found. It is strikingly descriptive of the Apostle's manner of life . . . it evinces a great and noble purpose to be entirely employed in one great aim and object--the promotion of the glory of God, in the face of danger and death."[3] Paul's language reveals evidence of thought and preparation, thereby showing a great concern on the part of the Apostle for those whom he has been privileged to call to the service of Christ. The speech is eminently pastoral in tone. It reminds us of his own comment to the Corinthians, "and besides everything else, the thing that burdens me every day is my anxiety about all the churches."[4]

The Historical Setting

Paul's Journey to Jerusalem

In A.D. 29, Ephesus was destroyed by an earthquake and restored by Tiberius. In A.D. 53-55, Christianity was planted there by Paul.[5] In A.D. 54-55, while Paul was ministering in Asia, a collection was in progress among the churches of Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia on behalf of the Christians at Jerusalem. The Apostle was coordinating this effort from his base at Ephesus. During this time he wrote across the Aegean Sea to the Corinthians, telling them that on the first day of every week each of them was to put something aside, according to how God had prospered them, and store it up so that contributions would not need to be taken when he arrived. When he arrived he would send those whom they accredited to carry their gift to Jerusalem. The Apostle added that if it seemed advisable he would go to Jerusalem also.[6] His letter is important not only for its instructions concerning the collection, but also for its glimpse into the future plans of Paul:

> Now I will come unto you, when I shall pass through Macedonia: for I do pass through Macedonia. And it may be that I will abide, yea, and winter with you, that ye may bring me on my journey whithersoever I go.[7]

As time passed and the collection grew, it apparently seemed advisable to Paul that he go with the gift to Jerusalem. Chase suggests that the Apostle viewed the journey as a means of promoting unity among the churches. The Apostle of the Gentiles would be the bearer of the generosity of the Gentiles, and would, himself, witness what he hoped would be the joyful acceptance of these gifts on the part of the Jewish Christians. Thus, the Jewish Churches of Palestine and the Churches of the Gentile world would be bound together in love.[8] For this important reason, Paul resolved in his spirit to pass through Macedonia and Achaia and go to Jerusalem, saying, "After I have been there I must also see Rome."[9] With his plans thus formed, he left shortly from Ephesus and went through parts of Macedonia, encouraging the churches in the area. Eventually he came to Corinth, where he spent three months.[10]

It was sometime during his stay in Corinth that it became apparent to Paul that the trip to Jerusalem, though necessary, would only be undertaken at the risk of his life. The animosity of the Jews which everywhere seethed against him was beginning to boil over. Already the Jews at Damascus had taken counsel to kill him, "laying await . . . they watched the gates day and night to kill him."[11] Envious Jews at Antioch were still speaking against him, contradicting and blaspheming.[12] He had barely escaped stoning at Iconium, and had been stoned and left for dead at Lystra.[13] A company of angry Jews had assaulted the house of Jason in Thessalonica, believing Paul to be there, and when they learned that he had gone on to Berea, they followed him there and stirred up the people against him.[14] There were those in Corinth who opposed him and blasphemed, and in Ephesus also many spoke evil of him.[15] A letter written from Corinth to Rome about this time reveals his concern about the danger. First, Paul explains his itinerary and its purpose to the Romans:

> . . . having a great desire these many years to come to you, whensoever I take my journey into Spain I will come to you: for I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company. But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at

> Jerusalem. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.[16]

At this point the Apostle is seized with a sense of urgency regarding his own safety:

> Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me; that I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judea; and that my service which I have in Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints.[17]

Paul's apprehensions were confirmed on the eve of his departure from Corinth, "when the Jews laid wait for him, as he was about to sail into Syria."[18] According to Ramsay, Paul was probably going to take a pilgrim ship carrying Achaian and Asian Jews to the Passover. A shipload of hostile Jews would easily find opportunity to kill the Apostle.[19] When Paul learned of their plot, he changed his plans, and instead of sailing directly to Jerusalem, he returned through Macedonia. Several weeks later, after circling the Aegean Sea, he finally boarded a ship at Assos and once again headed for Jerusalem, danger, and perhaps death.[20]

Paul's Summoning of the Ephesian Elders

By this time Paul had to hurry if it were going to be at all possible for him to be in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost.[21] But as his ship made its way down the Asian coast, he apparently began to think about the uncertainty of his future, and some of the good memories of the past. He longed to stop at Ephesus. He had spent nearly three years in Ephesus, a longer time than he had spent in any other place. And he had had a fruitful ministry: the power of God had worked through him to such an extent that "all they that dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks. . . . So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed."[22] Yet, even here, there had been an uproar against him, for the silversmiths who made silver shrines for the goddess Diana rioted, shouting that Paul had turned away many people by saying, "they be no gods which are made with hands."[23] Paul wisely departed for Macedonia.

Now Paul had not seen the Ephesian Christians for almost a year, and it seemed important and necessary that he stop and do so. They were soon to face certain dangers he knew of, and should warn them about, and there were other things he wanted to say to them, in case he should never see them again.

However, the Apostle knew that a detour to Ephesus could mean too long a delay in reaching Jerusalem. He might be detained by affairs of the church . . . or worse, by his adversaries. Therefore, Paul determined "to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia."[24] Instead, when his ship docked at Miletus, "from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church."[25] Ephesus was only about 37 miles from Miletus, so that a messenger could be sent on the short journey to get and return with the elders. Pfeiffer states that this would only take a few days, still making it possible for Paul to be at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost.[26]

The "elders" were the spiritual leaders of the church. They were responsible for the administration of its worship and other activities, and for the welfare of its members. They were men who knew Paul and loved him; there was no doubt in his mind that they would accept the invitation to meet him. Many of them had probably first recognized Jesus as their Saviour through the Apostle's preaching. As they came to see him, they provided the occasion for his sermon in Acts 20.

The Biblical Exposition

The Text of the Sermon

When all of the elders had assembled before him, Paul addressed them as follows:

> Ye know from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all season.
>
> Serving the Lord with all humility of mind, and with many tears, and temptations, which befell me by the lying in wait of the Jews.
>
> And how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house.
>
> Testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.
>
> And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there:

Save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me.

But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.

And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more.

Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men.

For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.

Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His blood.

For I know this, that after my departing, shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.

Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.

Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn everyone night and day with tears.

And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of His grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are santified.

I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel.

Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me.

I have shewed you all things, how that so laboring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how He said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.

The Content and Organization of the Sermon

What is Paul trying to say? What is he trying to accomplish? Is there an organizational pattern in his message? How does the thought progress? What are the reasoning processes in this speech?

The Theme and Purpose of the Sermon.--The theme and purpose of Paul's message are expressed by the words, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock." Everything he has to say either leads up to or follows from this central injunction. His aim is to persuade the elders of Ephesus to guard themselves and the church against the dangers that are going to come.

The Structure and Outline of the Sermon.--To achieve this goal, Paul structures his message around his own experience and around the perils that will threaten the elders. He presents his own response to external trouble and internal temptation as an example to the elders of the way in which they also should go about guarding the flock and themselves. His is a message of exhortation, based upon his own example and soon departure from them. In outline form, his sermon could appear as follows:

Introduction

I. You yourselves know my example among you. (Appeal to memories.)

    A. You know how I served the church in the face of external trouble.

      1. I was troubled by the plots of the Jews.
      2. Yet I continued in all that was profitable
   B. You see how I am denying myself in the face of internal temptation.
      1. I am tempted by the apprehension of certain danger in the future.
      2. Yet, for the sake of the gospel, I do not consider my life dear.
II. Now this example has come to an end.
   A. You will see my face no more.
   B. I am free from the blood of all.

Theme

As overseers of the church you must follow my example: Be on guard for yourselves and for all the flock.

Arrangement and development of ideas

I. Be on guard for all the flock against external trouble.
   A. You will be troubled by false teachers from within and without.
   B. Therefore shepherd the church and remember my example of service and character.
II. Be on guard for yourselves against internal temptation.
   A. You will be tempted to profit financially from the ministry.
   B. Therefore remember that the Lord is your reward and will Himself reward you, and remember my self-denial.

Conclusion

It is more blessed to give than to receive.

The development of Paul's sermon is simple and direct. The scene is one of the most moving in all the New Testament. In fact, the words scarcely need comment.

Arrangement and Development of Ideas with Emphasis upon Logos

What content and development of ideas is to be found in this speech?

Paul begins by reminding the elders of his example among them in the face of external trouble. Despite Jewish plots against him, he served with all humility and tears, not shrinking from preaching and teaching publicly and in various houses, bearing witness to both Jews and Greeks of repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus.[27] The Apostle's listeners know that he has been "in peril every hour" in their city.[28]

Luke does not describe all of these plots in detail in his narrative of Paul's Ephesian ministry.[29] However, the physician does record that Jewish hostility forced Paul out of the synagogue and into the hall of Tyrannus.[30] He also mentions the activity of the Jews during the riot of the silversmiths, though it is difficult to determine their exact role in the uprising.[31] The best picture of Paul's tribulations during this time is found in his correspondance with the Corinthians, part of which was written while at Ephesus. In I Corinthians 16:8, 9, Paul reports that a wide door of effectual work and opportunity is open to him at Ephesus, but "there are many adversaries." At the beginning of his second letter, he describes what it was like in Ephesus:

> For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life:
>
> But we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead.[32]

At another time the Apostle listed his tribulations:

> . . . in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep: In journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watching often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness.[33]

He declares, "I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death: for we are made a spectacle unto the world . . . fools . . . weak . . . despised . . . we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place . . . we are made the filth of the world, and are the offscouring of all things unto this day."[34]

Again speaking of his experience at Ephesus, he states that "after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus."[35]

It seems impossible to exaggerate the animosity of the Ephesian Jews. They were also the ones responsible for causing Paul's persecution in Jerusalem, for they, "when they saw him in the temple, stirred up all the people, and laid hands on him, crying out, Men of Israel, help! this is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place."[36] They even accused him of polluting the holy temple by bringing Greeks into it.

Yet throughout all his troubles, now it can be said that Paul has not refrained from anything that might be of spiritual profit to the people. The Ephesian elders know this.

After reminding them of his past example, Paul turns to his present circumstances and reveals his response to the internal temptation he is now facing. He is now under an inner compulsion to go to Jerusalem; he is "bound in the spirit" to go. The commentators argue whether Paul's words should be rendered "bound in the spirit" (his own), or "bound in the Spirit" (the Holy Spirit). The addition of the word "Holy" in verses 24 and 28 might suggest that Paul's own spirit is in view here. However, the argument is of little import, since Paul considered his own spirit to be under the control of the Holy Spirit anyway. Though he does not know fully what will happen to him in the city, he is certain that he will receive a hostile reception, for the Holy Spirit has witnessed to him repeatedly that imprisonment and distress await him.[37] This witness to which Paul testifies before the elders does continue even after he leaves them; when he later tarries at Tyre for seven days, disciples there warn him "through the Spirit, that he should not go up to Jersualem."[38] Later, in Caesarea, at the home of Philip the evangelist, the prophet Agabus

> took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, Thus Saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles.[39]

Nevertheless, Paul is ready "not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus."[40] He is not yielding to any inward temptation to fear for his life or to withdraw from his mission. "None of these things move me," he tells the Ephesian elders, "neither count I my life dear unto myself."[41] Not that Paul did not value his life at all, but that he valued it only insofar as it meant something to others, and could be lived for the sake of the church, not for his own sake. For this reason his main concern is not to protect himself, but to bear witness to the gospel of the grace of God, that grace which will be sufficient for him through all pain and peril. As he later wrote the Philippians:

> According to my earnest expectation and my hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness as always, so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death.
>
> For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.
>
> But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better; Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you.[42]

This has been Paul's example to the Ephesians: diligent service and testimony in the face of external hostility and tribulation, and complete self-denial in the face of temptation. But now his example is coming to an end, for he is speaking to them for the last time, and they will see his face no more. Even if, by God's grace, he is spared from the hands of those who hate him, he intends to go to Rome and then to Spain,[43] so that he is saying goodbye to the province of Asia.

Certain comments of the Apostle's in his later letters to Timothy seem to hint that he actually did visit Ephesus again. For example:

> As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia . . . these things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; . . . till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine . . . The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus . . . in how many things he ministered unto me at Ephesus, thou knowest very well.[44]

However, as Hendriksen states, a reconstruction of Paul's itinerary after his first Roman imprisonment cannot be made with any certainty:

> Where did he go immediately after his release? We simply do not know with any degree of certainty. The Pastorals, to be sure, imply a number of journeys, but these are merely "links" which can be joined together in ever so many different ways.[45]

Still, even if Paul should return to Ephesus again, for all practical purposes at the time of his Farewell to the Ephesian elders, his real ministry among them is over. Both he and they believe that this is their last time of fellowship together. Paul has declared the whole counsel of God's will among them. If there are any who have remained indifferent or antagonistic, their blood will be upon their own heads. Like the faithful watchman of Ezekiel, Paul claims freedom from responsibility for their doom:

> Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel . . . if thou warn the wicked, and he turn not from his wickedness, nor from his wicked way, he shall die in his iniquity; but thou hast delivered thy soul . . . if thou warn the righteous man, that the righteous sin not, and he doth not sin, he shall surely live, because he is warned; also thou hast delivered thy soul.[46]

Now, what the Apostle has done, he asks the elders of Ephesus to do. From now on the responsibility for the ministry in that city lies with them. At this point he has arrived at the theme of his sermon. The review of his example and the announcement of his departure have prepared the way for his central exhortation; he earnestly and emphatically pleads, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock."

Paul's development of this theme follows the same twofold development of his own example. First, he warns the elders of the external trouble that they will encounter, and then he reveals the internal temptation they will face. In each instance, he reminds them again of his own response when confronted with similar circumstances, and encourages them to follow his example.

First, the Apostle exhorts the elders to guard the flock against external trouble:

> Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath

> purchased with His Own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.[47]

As good shepherds, the elders must guard God's sheep with unceasing vigilance, for when the Apostle is gone the false teachers will spring among the flock and cause great havoc, ravaging the sheep unless the elders are watching carefully.

The danger, however, will not only come from without: "Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."[48] From within the Christian community itself, men will arise and begin to pervert the truth. They will twist the apostolic teachings in an attempt to build their own following, distorting sound doctrine and luring believers into heresy. It is the elder's responsibility to nourish the sheep upon the truth so that they cannot be led astray. A good shepherd uses his rod and staff to protect and guide, and he feeds his sheep in green pastures, so that they are satisfied and grow strong. Paul expects the leaders of the Ephesian church to do these things with the same zeal and earnestness that characterized his own ministry among them, remembering "that by the space of three years" he "ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears."[49]

Furthermore, Paul knows that the elders themselves will be tempted, and that they must guard against temptation with a spirit of self-denial. He warns them that they will be tempted to profit financially from the ministry, and to desire personal gain or material comfort, but that such coveting will be a snare to them. They themselves can testify that he resisted the impulse to gain financially from his position among them. They know that he coveted no one's silver or gold or apparel.[50] In ancient times wealth was measured in clothing, gold, and silver. That is why a man could lose his riches to the moth as well as to rust and thieves, and why Jesus urged, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven."[51] And again, at another time He taught:

> Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.[52]

Paul also reminds the Ephesian elders that his own hands have ministered to his needs. In the Greek text, Bruce asserts, "these words occupy an emphatic position at the end of the sentence; they were no doubt accompanied by an appropriate gesture."[53] Paul probably pursued his tentmaking trade at Ephesus, with Aquila and Priscilla, for we read of the three of them:

> . . . Paul . . . found a certain Jew named Aquila . . . with his wife Priscilla; . . . and because he was of the same craft he abode with them, and wrought: for by their occupation they were tentmakers . . . And Paul . . . sailed and with him Priscilla and Aquila . . . and he came to Ephesus, and left them there: but he himself entered into the synagogue, and reasoned with the Jews.[54]

Furthermore, the Apostle reminds his friends that he ministered not only to his own needs, but also to the needs of those who were with him. The reference is to Timothy, Erastus, Luke, and others who travelled with the Apostle. Paul's earnings probably went toward their expenses as they travelled through Asia with the gospel. If Timothy were already suffering "often infirmities,"[55] he may not have been able to work at times, and could have been the cause of additional expense. Yet at all times, the Apostle Paul asserts, he was an example to the Ephesian believers of how a leader ought to shepherd the flock without thought of himself or material reward.

By his example Paul did not mean to teach that a minister could not earn his living by means of the gospel. On the contrary, he taught that "they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel," and "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto (share with) him that teacheth, in all good things."[57] The Apostle had also taught the Gentiles that having been made partakers of the Jews' spiritual things, it was right to minister unto the Jews in carnal things.[58] However, Paul knew that there were times when a leader needed to give up this right of support for the sake of his ministry. To the Corinthians he wrote, "Nevertheless we have not used this power, but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ,"[59] . . . "that . . . I may make the gospel of Christ without charge."[60] And again, to the Thessalonians he wrote, "neither did we eat any man's bread for nought; but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you . . . to make ourselves an example unto you."[61] Evidently the circumstances in Ephesus were such that it would be wise for the elders to discourage anything that had to do with their own financial support, thereby avoiding the appearance of mercenary intentions.

The Apostle next explains, "I have shewed you all things, how that so labouring ye ought to support the weak."[62] The word "weak" here could mean the poor or physically sick, unable to take care of themselves. If so, Paul is exhorting the elders to provide for the physical needs of those under their charge, just as his own hands have ministered to the needs of those travelling with him. This would be fulfillment of the Apostle's own commands, ". . . give to him that needeth" . . . and distribute "to the necessity of saints."[63] On the other hand, the word "weak" could mean "weak in faith"; that is, those believers not yet sufficiently mature in the faith. Such believers might more easily be led to suspect the elders of mercenary motives. These "weak" are not to be received to "doubtful disputations,"[64] but rather, the "strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please themselves,"[65] so that the weak will be saved and supported.[66] If this last interpretation is the correct one, then Paul is urging the elders to follow his example of waiving his rightful support for the sake of the ministry. With either interpretation, the appeal is for a spirit of complete self-denial based on the Apostle's own example. In Saint Paul's oral and written message is found an unprecedented emphasis upon Jewish ethics, and the duties of universal Christian love.

Paul concludes his message with the exhortation, ". . . remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how He said, It is more blessed to give than to receive."[67] Actually, this saying is not found in any of the four Gospels, yet Paul's command to "remember" suggests that the words were familiar to the elders and could be brought to their minds. Possibly a collection of the sayings of Jesus was compiled and circulated at Ephesus. The words sum up all that the Apostle has been saying. The elders are to deny themselves every material advantage, laboring unreservedly for the church, and in return they will find a greater blessedness: "an inheritance among all them which are sanctified."[68] The inheritance Paul speaks of is the present and eternal enjoyment of the riches of God that are in Christ Jesus, a blessed inheritance "in the kingdom of Christ and of God."[69] The Apostle's exhortation here is similar to the one he gave the Colossians: "And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance; for ye serve the Lord Christ."[70]

To this end Paul commends his friends "to God and to the word of His grace" which is able to build them up.[71] Since his own example among them is coming to an end, he entrusts them to God, confident that the Lord will, through His word, produce in them the Christ-like spirit of self-denial which will guard them against any inward temptation.

In summary, Paul's sermon to the Ephesian elders is one they will not have difficulty remembering. He begins with a reminder of his own example, of how he diligently served the church in the face of external tribulation, and of how he denied himself for the sake of his ministry in the face of inward temptation. He then reveals that his example among them is coming to an end. The responsibility for the Ephesian church now belongs to the elders alone. They must imitate Paul's example and be on guard for themselves and for all the flock against the external danger of false teachers and the internal temptation to financial profit. They must dedicate themselves to a ministry of service that will fulfill their calling as faithful overseers of the church of God.

The Rhetorical Analysis

The Response to the Sermon

Luke records that the immediate response of the elders to Paul's message was one of sorrow and great grief. When the Apostle had finished speaking, he knelt down with them all and prayed. By now the elders were all in tears, sorrowing at the thought that they would see his face no more.[72] They began to embrace Paul and to kiss him repeatedly. "The imperfect κατεφίλουν expresses the lingering of the parting and not only that each man kissed Paul while embracing him, but also that each one could hardly let him go."[73] They lingered about him, reluctant to let him out of their sight. But the time had come to part, so they walked the distance to the ship with him, thus spending the last possible moments in his presence.

This last act is impressive with the goodwill, unity of feeling, and deep emotion in humility that Paul has established with the elders. Their expressed affection and sorrow at his parting marks this as truly a speech of eloquence. And eloquence is always an aim to persuasion.

In addition to this immediate and emotional outpouring, there was also a prolonged and resolute response to Paul's sermon. The elders were instantly touched by the announcement of his departure, but also, and more importantly, they were permanently affected by his warnings of the future. The Apostle's words of exhortation made such an impression on his friends that for years to come they zealously guarded the flock from false teachers and themselves from covetousness.

The Apostle predicted that the Ephesian elders would be troubled externally by false teachers. Fierce wolves from without would ravage the flock, and perverters from within would attempt to lead the sheep astray. This prediction came to pass in just a few years, as false teachers from without and within assaulted the church of Ephesus. The record of their activity is preserved in the two letters Paul wrote to Timothy, a young pastor in Ephesus. (Timothy's location at Ephesus is mentioned at the beginning of Paul's first letter to him: "I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus,"[74] and Hendriksen states that though the second letter does not say where the recipient was, there are several passages which point to Ephesus.)[75]

The false teachers who assaulted from without seem to have been Judaisers with an interest in speculative matters. Occupying themselves with "fables and endless genealogies," these men promoted "questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith."[76] They were full of "profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called,"[77] and engaged in "foolish and unlearned questions" that "do gender strifes."[78] The speculative Judaism threatening Ephesus should be distinguished from the Pharisaic Judaism which troubled Rome and Galatia by its insistence on circumcision and the observance of the law. According to Fenton Hort, the "fables and genealogies" promoted by speculative Judaisers in Ephesus were the profuse legends which had grown up among the Jews concerning the patriarchs and other heroes of early Mosaic history.[79] Giving themselves to strife "about words to no profit," these Judaisers subverted their hearers.[80] The full description of their nature and activities pictures them as being:

> lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: . . . of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.
>
> Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith.[81]

The "oppositions" and "questions" of these speculative Judaisers represented the different interpretative decisions of the competing schools of Hillel and Shammai. According to Hort, the Jewish Halacha was full of these myriad and contrasting opinions, based on endless and minute distinctions.[82]

Passing themselves off as genuine "apostles,"[83] these bickerers began to ravage the flock. Their proud desire for controversy without knowledge, and "doting about questions and strifes of words" produced "envy, strife, railings, and evil surmisings."[84] These were the "perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness,"[85] who increased "unto more ungodliness."[86] Their word ate like a canker.[87]

Perhaps influenced by the doctrines of these enemies from without, false teachers also arose from within the Ephesian community and began to speak perversions. Among their own selves some turned from "love out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned . . . unto vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they would say, nor whereof they did affirm."[88] The Pastoral Epistles mention many of these defectors. Hymenaeus and Alexander rejected a good conscience, and having put away faith, "make shipwreck" of it, and blasphemed.[89] Phygelus and Hermogenes were among those in Asia who turned away from Paul and his teaching.[90] Hymanaeus and Philetus erred concerning the truth and overthrew the faith of some by saying that the resurrection was past already.[91] Still others gave "heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats."[92]

Lane suggests that this ascetic perversion was linked to the other false teaching about the resurrection's having already passed. The false teachers taught that because of the resurrection:

> the Christian community had been projected into the Age to come, and that the conditions of life in that age were now in force. The resurrection lay in the past, and therefore Jesus' statement that in the resurrection men neither marry nor give their children in marriage demanded that marriage cease. The prohibition against meats is understandable on the same basis. Had not the risen Jesus indicated by His Own example that the food

to be taken after the resurrection was fish or honeycomb? Further appeal could be made to Paul's dictum that the Kingdom of God was not meat and drink.[93]

From without and within, therefore, the false teachers began to trouble the Ephesian church. But when they came, the elders of the church remembered the words of Paul and began to guard the flock. Like true shepherds they nourished the sheep "on the words of the faith and of good doctrine," and refused "profane and old wives' fables."[94] In the face of false doctrine, they fed the flock with the inspired scriptures, using them profitably for "doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."[95] Confronted by external danger, they followed and held fast the "form of sound words" which they had heard of Paul, and by the power of the Holy Spirit kept the truth that was committed to them.[96] They remembered the Apostle's example, how that for three years he did not cease night and day to admonish each one with tears, and they imitated him. They preached the word, and were "instant in season, out of season"; reproving, rebuking, exhorting with all long-suffering and doctrine.[97] They were not given to strife, as were their enemies; rather, they were "gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing" those who opposed themselves, that God might "give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth," and that they might "recover themselves out of the snare of the devil."[98]

In all these ways the elders of the church of Ephesus followed the example of Paul and served with diligence and earnest proclamation of the truth in the face of external trouble. They so guarded the flock against the wolves from without and the perverters from within that foryears to come the Ephesian church was known for the purity of its faith. Repeated testimony indicates that the Christians of Ephesus remained steadfast in sound doctrine and rejected the false teachers. Saint John, writing from the city in his old age, admits that many antichrists did indeed come to Ephesus. But he quickly adds:

> They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.[99]

The placing of John in Ephesus is done, among others, by Iranaeus, who speaks of "the church in Ephesus, founded by Paul, and having John remaining among them permanently until the times of Trajan."[100] The Son of Man among the lampstands also acknowledges that false teachers did not remain long in Ephesus. He commends the church for their careful scrutiny of would-be teachers, saying:

> I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou has tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars:[101]

and he adds ". . . this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitanes, which I also hate."[102]

The doctrine of the Nicolaitanes is compared to the "doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication."[103] The Nicolaitans seem to have been an antinomian sect that advocated pagan sexual laxity within the church. According to Irenaeus, they led "lives of unrestrained indulgence" and taught that it was "a matter of indifference to practice adultery and to eat things sacrificed to idols."[104]

Even in the second century the church of Ephesus is still being praised for its doctrinal soundness, Ignatius of Antioch, on his way to a Roman martyrdom in A.D. 110, writes to the Ephesian church:

> Indeed, Onesimus himself highly praises your orderliness in God, because you all live in accordance with the truth and because no heresy dwells among you, indeed, you do not even listen to anyone unless he speaks truly of Jesus Christ.[105]

All of this testimony is evidence of the diligent, thorough work of the elders. The words of Paul so profoundly affected them that for years to come they zealously guarded the flock from the external problems of false teachers.

The elders responded similarly to Paul's second exhortation by guarding themselves from the internal temptation to profit from the ministry. As overseers of the flock they denied themselves every material advantage. They were not greedy of "filthy lucre,"[106] looking for financial reward, nor did they conceive of godliness as a means of gain.[107] Rather, having food and raimnent, they were content.[108] At all times they carefully guarded themselves from covetousness, knowing that:

> they that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition . . . for the love of money is the root of all evil, which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.[109]

They so successfully guarded themselves against any gain from their ministry that Paul was compelled to give a balancing exhortation to the church. Realizing that the elders were going without any recompense whatever, the Apostle instructed the Ephesians through Timothy:

> Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine. For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And the labourer is worthy of his reward.[110]

This, then, is the powerful and lasting effect that Paul's message had on the Ephesian elders. The long-range response indicates that he thoroughly accomplished his purpose to persuade the elders to be on guard for themselves and for all the flock. In achieving this goal, the Apostle was supported by the rhetorical choices he made, for every aspect of his message is adapted to the immediate audience before him.

The Appropriateness of the Theme to the Occasion and Audience

In none of Paul's speeches is it difficult to find the clear emergence of a theme. The theme of his sermon at Miletus, "Be on guard for yourselves and for all the flock," is appropriate to this occasion and audience from several standpoints.

First, Paul's theme is appropriate to the spirit of the occasion. This is the last time that he and the elders of Ephesus will meet together. He is bidding farewell to the Aegean shores; if he manages to get safely away from the hostile Jews at Jerusalem, the western Mediterranean is to be his field of ministry. This is the last time these friends will see his face. This is not a time to give a didactic lecture, or argumentative analysis, then; it is, rather, a time to reflect on a long and intimate association, to look to separate futures, and to exhort to imitation. Paul chooses a theme fitting for such an occasion.

Second, and obviously, the theme is designed for Christians. This is not an evangelistic address. It does not focus on the fulfillment of Jewish promises or on the knowledge of natural revelation. Instead, it is a message of exhortation, applicable only to those who have already come to faith in Jesus Christ.

Finally, the theme is particularly designed for the elders of the church of Ephesus. It is not a general exhortation which would have been equally appropriate in any worship service, for it specifically has to do with the position and responsibilities of church leaders. Moreover, it is not even a message which could have been given just as easily to the leaders of a different church, for it concerns itself too fully with the historical circumstances of Ephesus. It is a theme with a very narrow and direct focus, having primary application to a select segment of a certain church.

In all of these ways, then, Paul's theme is eminently appropriate. He is speaking to Christians, leaders of the church of Ephesus, men who have known and loved him for years, friends who are gathering for the last time. They come expectantly, they part sorrowingly, but they remember his message and they follow his example. Cicero said, "Let us regard the orator . . . as the man who can speak in a manner adapted to win the assent of his audience."[111]

The Structure of the Sermon

The totality of Paul's reasoning logically enforces his theme, conforms to the general rules of argumentative development, and "approaches a measure of truth adequate for purpose of action."[112]

However, because the particular occasion under consideration is the reverse of being abstract or impersonal, we should look not only for the elements described above, but also for considerable warmth of expression. We could expect that the Apostle's most appropriate logic in this case would be the logic of demonstration through self-revelation, rather than that achieved through links in a chain of reasoning. That which would probably carry most weight with the individuals he has won to Christ would be a demonstration of his own sincerity. With these considerations in mind, let us inquire, how does the Apostle argue his case? What are his underlying assumptions? Is the plan of arrangement particularly accommodated to the audience situation?

A study of this discourse suggests that it is the ethical appeal indeed which gives weight and power to the whole. Paul uses no formal argument, and much of the pathetic appeal is made through the revelation of his own goodwill in such a way as probably to stir up a similar response in his hearers. Paul's previous conduct and reputation constitute a large part of his ethical appeal.

The Apostle begins his speech by revealing that he has confidence in his audience. "Ye know," recognizes them as all people enjoy being recognized, with fairness and knowledge. It also denotes mutual understanding. It is a mark of courtesy which is very important in persuasion. "Courtesy should not be merely assumed, but should rest upon fairness of spirit and also genuine respect for one's audience."[113] Hence, Paul's opening sentence reveals that his character is one of reason, refinement, and consideration, and that therefore his message is very likely upright and trustworthy. It also reveals intimacy, affection, and authority.

Paul has done what Longinus describes as having "sifted out the most significant details on the basis of merit, so to speak, and joined them harmoniously without inserting between them anything irrelevant, frivolous, or artificial."[114] The Apostle wastes no time on side issues or humor. He drives immediately to the main points that are the heart of his speech and links them together as a worthy basis for his argument. Paul appeals again and again to the elders' full knowledge of his own behavior. They themselves know how he lived among them from the first day that he set foot in Asia. They know that he did not shrink from anything that was profitable, but diligently and thoroughly served the church in the face of external trouble. They see now that he is unhesitatingly bound for Jerusalem, denying the inward temptation to seek his own safety. They can bear witness that he declared the whole counsel of God to them, and is, therefore, free from the blood of all. They can recall that for three years he did not cease night and day to admonish each one with tears. They know that he coveted no one's silver or gold or clothing, ministering instead to his own needs through the labor of his hands. The elders are fully aware of all of these things, and the Apostle does not hesitate to build his sermon around the knowledge they have.

Paul decides to use personal examples as supporting material for two reasons. First of all, this is perhaps the best way he has of giving them a clear pattern to follow. As Carter and Earle note:

> The Jews possessed the Old Testament Scriptures and the instruction and examples they afforded for their directives. Before Paul wrote them, the Gentiles at Ephesus were devoid of any written instruction in Christian righteousness, as were the Thessalonians. Hence the importance of Paul's godly example before them, if they were to attain unto correct Christian deportment.[115]

At that time the Apostle's own behavior was the only objective standard available by which a Christian leader could measure his own commitment and service. This is one reason Paul so fully reminds them of his personal example.

But besides this need for a model to imitate, Paul's choice of personal example as supporting material is also appropriate to this audience because of its persuasive potential. His most effective means of persuading the elders to be on guard for themselves and for all the flock is through a reminder of his own character and behavior. Aristotle, as early as the fourth century B.C., recognized that a speaker's "moral character" is probably a more powerful means of persuasion than either his logical arguments or his emotional appeals.[116] Recent studies in communication have verified this observation, demonstrating that "the greater the trustworthiness or expertness, the greater the change toward the position advocated by the communicator."[117] Minnick summarizes the principle thus:

> Men are strongly inclined to accept as probably true, statements made by persons whom they admire and respect. If the character and personality of the speaker elicit admiration and respect from an audience, the likelihood that he will win belief is increased.[118]

In light of this concept, Paul's decision to use examples of his own character or "ethos" is clear confirmation of his skill as a speaker. Given this particular audience, there is no more fitting way that he could have argued his case or supported his exhortations than by references to his own behavior. The Ephesian elders had the highest admiration and respect for the Apostle, and this was Paul's underlying assumption for the speech. Their immediate reaction to the announcement that they would never see him again reveals that his assumption was correct, and the extent of their affection and regard for him. Realizing, therefore, that these men love and trust him, Paul wisely chooses that supporting material which will have the greatest persuasive force with this particular group of listeners. He leaves them to conclude that they should conduct themselves according to the pattern he has portrayed. Paul definitely wishes action from the elders. The philosophy of Professor Winans is exemplified by the Apostle: "What to do, then, if we wish to persuade? If there is no positive objection, the task seems to be to present the Action so that it will hold attention and overcome the competition of other attractive ideas."[119] This is just what Paul did: merely hold the attention of the elders on the life he desired them to follow until they had time to understand, be persuaded, and assent.

Having set in their minds what was expected of them, the Apostle shows the burden of responsibility to be on the overseers of the church from henceforth, because he will see them no more. He prepares with reason the way, then presents the desired steps for them to take. In conclusion, he points them to the words of Jesus which are the summation with power of all he has been saying. The words of the Master are intended to clinch an argument which has not been diffuse or verbose, but brief and closely reasoned. Paul's speech is a direct oral plea, a personal, searching challenge which the elders accept. Reckless of posterity, it is directed to the immediate occasion. Again, as at Antioch, the full impact and meaning of Paul's message is not in until his last words--a powerful principle--are spoken. This characteristic would be found, Cicero indicated, in the ideal orator.

Paul uses the Ciceronian topic of distribution of past and present: presenting both his past and present life as a pattern to be followed, and intertwining it with the Ciceronian topic of consistency: the consistency of his own life with his teachings, consistency of the elders' lives with the pattern he has set, and consistency with the teachings of Jesus. In devising his argument he also follows the Topic-questions of Rhetoric, "What, when, where, how, and why?":

> "What?"--"Ye know . . . after what manner I have been with you."
>
> "When?"--"at all seasons"; "by the space of three years."

"Where?"--Ephesus--"with you."

"How?"----"with all humility of mind and with many tears and temptations."

"Why?"----"so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." And also because "ye all . . . shall see my face no more," and "that so labouring ye ought to" follow my example and the words of Jesus.

Of the arguments prescribed by classical rhetoric, one is the argument from probability by including the man's previous life, dwelling on his merits, and thus creating a prejudice in his favor. Cicero used this argument much for the constitutio coniecturalis. Classical rhetoric also included the doctrine of loci, the "places" in which arguments could be discovered. The loci for making an audience well disposed toward the speaker could be found in the speaker's own character.[120] Paul uses this form of argument following Cicero's stress that the method of arrangement should always be adapted to the purpose of the speech. Cicero himself said that De Oratore included principles of Aristotle and Isocrates, and Paul seems to follow Aristotle's three primary modes of persuasion which Cicero recognized. The Apostle uses the first mode of persuasion, the character of the speaker, from his first words, "Ye know . . . after what manner I . . . and how I . . ." The second mode of persuasion was to stir up emotion in the listeners. The Apostle does this by describing the bonds and afflictions that await him, and by declaring that his audience will see his face no more. Further, his calling to their minds his earnest and self-denying service to them had no doubt already stirred up other emotions within them. Using the third mode of Aristotle, he seeks to demonstrate the truth he proclaims, describing in detail his way of life, the tribulations which are to come, and what their response must be. His narratio is a statement of facts, not scientifically demonstrated truths, but persuasive argument, that with which rhetoric concerns itself. His conclusion follows classical lines of brevity and summarization.

The overall structure of Paul's speech is deliberative, for he is urging an assembly of people to follow his proposed course of action, which is possible and for their benefit, is necessary and will do good. As a deliberative orator in the classical tradition, he speaks of what is praiseworthy and right.[121]

Analysis of Style and Delivery

The ancient writer Longinus once stated, "men whose thoughts and concerns are mean and petty throughout life cannot produce anything admirable or worthy of lasting fame."[122] On the other hand, he declares, "Excellence belongs to those of high spirit."[123] Classical rhetoric recognized that the perfection of the orator is based on nature as well as practice. The Apostle Paul, in his sermon at Miletus, exemplifies "a strong and inspired emotion," "dignity of mind," the "noble purpose" to die, if need be, for the gospel, and "vigor of mental conception" such as Longinus had in mind. The Apostle mentally conceives of a strong, well-nourished church able to withstand the wolves, its shepherd-overseers willing and able to withstand personal temptation.

Paul also demonstrates the ability to be master of all styles and to use them as occasion demands. The speech to the Ephesians is very different in style from that given in Antioch, and from the one at Athens. This fact is in keeping with the precepts of classical rhetoric, for Cicero would not commit himself to a set of rules. Principles of style, he declared, are gleaned from psychology and from experience. No two speech situations are exactly the same. One must come to a theory about oneself and human beings in order to be a good orator, so as to persuade and move. The classical approach was always pragmatic and functional. Nevertheless, Cicero did discuss the four virtues of good style: propriety, correctness, perspicuity, and ornamentation. Paul's message at Miletus exemplifies all four of these, as Cicero set them forth.

Paul's speech at Miletus is one of propriety, being appropriate to the background of his hearers. While the sermon in Acts 13 has a Semitic flavor, and the address in Acts 17 tends toward classical Greek, Paul's message at Miletus is couched in words and phrases that are reminiscent of his own letters to Christians. As he speaks to the Ephesian elders, he uses the words, phrases, images, and concepts that they have long been accustomed to hear from him.

Many commentators have noted this "linguistic affinity between the discourse and the Apostle's writings."[124] Robertson remarks on the "characteristic Pauline words, phrases, and ideas."[125] Alexander sees "a multitude of verbal similarities between this speech and the epistles,"[126] and Chase demonstrates "that in this speech, the language and the thoughts bear the closest resemblance to the language and thoughts of St. Paul's epistles."[127] Paul's stylistic adaptation to his audience through his choice of vocabulary and ideas will be further expanded upon shortly.

It has already been pointed out that this speech also has propriety in that its theme is appropriate to an occasion of farewell, and that it is designed for Christians. Furthermore, the address is particularly appropriate to an audience with the positions and responsibilities of church leadership.

In his discussion of perspicuity as a desirable element of style, Cicero asserts that language is clear if it is intelligent, and that the way to be clear is to adopt words that amply express without ambiguity or obtuseness. This requirement also logically follows the virtue of good style, "correctness"; the correct form of a word in case, tense, gender, and number contributes to clarity. Correctness includes brevity, also. Paul's speech is not verbose and rambling, but brief and direct. The Apostle makes himself intelligible to his audience by using word forms correctly, and by using the words, phrases, and ideas which the elders have already come to associate with him. He also makes himself clear by exciting their imagination and memory--another suggestion of Cicero. By "imagination," the author of Roman eloquence did not mean "fancy" or "fancifulness," but rather "image-making." Paul sets before the minds of his listeners memories and images of himself teaching them publicly, and from house to house, warning everyone day and night with tears, and laboring with his own hands to minister unto his own and other necessities. He also uses metaphor and allusion. The four following tests of clarity or perspicuity are all met by Paul:

1. Thorough knowledge and understanding of the ideas. Paul reveals a thorough knowledge and understanding of the ideas presented because he is speaking of his own experiences, many of which his audience themselves have witnessed. He is also convinced of the idea that afflictions and distresses await him at Jerusalem, because the Holy Spirit in every city has made him thoroughly acquainted with the fact, and because he has been warned, once very graphically, by the servants of Christ. He is convinced that for this reason his friends at Ephesus will see his face no more. Yet none of these things move him.

In addition to knowledge of ideas relating to himself, Paul reveals knowledge of the ways of men and the strategems of Satan. The Apostle has suffered sufficient animosity, opposition, and tribulation himself to foresee the dangers which will arise within the flock at Ephesus. He knows that men will arise speaking perverse things, trying to draw disciples after themselves, and thus decimate the Christian community. He also knows the temptations toward personal gain that come with leadership. However, along with this knowledge, he has proven that to those who are faithful and to those who overcome, God will extend the riches of Himself and His Kingdom. Paul understands all of the concepts he presents because he has lived them before teaching them. Like Jesus, Himself, the Apostle began first to do and then to teach.[128]

2. Discerning vocabulary. Paul seeks to make his message clear by a vocabulary that clearly pictures what has been and what is to come, so that his audience can see it. He uses words that describe activities they have witnessed or with which they are already familiar, or will be familiar. For example, "from house to house," "publicly," "every city," "my face," "declare the counsel of God," "these hands have ministered," "have taught," "have shewed you all things," "men will arise," "feed the church of God." The words, phrases, and ideas he presents are those which this Christian audience have been accustomed to hearing from him and would, therefore, have no difficulty in understanding.

Paul's stylistic adaptation to his audience through the use of characteristic Pauline thoughts and vocabulary is illustrated below. A full documentation of his adaptation would be very extensive; however, these are some of the more conspicuous examples:

Acts 20:18 "Ye know, from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you in all seasons." This thought is also found in:

(I Corinthians 2:3; Galatians 4:13; Philippians 4:15; I Thessalonians 2:1-12; 3:4; 4:2; II Thessalonians 3:7-9).

Acts 20:19 "serving the Lord"

(Romans 1:1; 12:11; 14:18; 16:18; II Corinthians 4:5; Galatians 1:10; Ephesians 6:7; Philippians 1:1; 2:22; Colossians 3:24; 4:12; I Thessalonians 1:9; II Timothy 2:24; Titus 1:1).

"with all humility"

(Ephesians 4:2; Philippians 2:3; Colossians 2:18; 23; 3:12).

Acts 20:21 "testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks."

(Romans 1:16; 2:9, 10; 3:29, 30; 9:24; 10:12; I Corinthians 1:24; 12:13; Galatians 3:28; Colossians 3:11).

Acts 20:24 "Neither count I my life dear unto myself"

(II Corinthians 4:7-12; 6:3-10; 12:9, 10; Philippians 1:20-25; Colossians 1:24).

"so that I might finish my course with joy"

(I Corinthians 9:24-26; Galatians 2:2; Philippians 2:16; 3:12-14; II Timothy 4:7).

"and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus"

(Romans 1:4, 5; 11:13; 15:31; I Corinthians 11:23; II Corinthians 3:6; 4:1; 5:18; 6:3, 4; 11:23; Galatians 1:1, 12; Ephesians 3:7; Colossians 1:23, 25; 4:17; I Timothy 1:12; 4:6; II Timothy 4:5, 11).

"to testify the gospel of the grace of God"

(Romans 3-6, 11; I Corinthians 1:3, 4; 3:10; 15:10; II Corinthians 1:12; 6:1; Galatians 2:21; Ephesians 1:7; 2:7-10; 3:2; Colossians 1:6).

Acts 20:26 "Wherefore I take you to record this day"

(Romans 10:2; II Corinthians 8:3; Galatians 4:15; 5:3; Ephesians 4:17; Colossians 4:13).

Acts 20:28 "the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers"

(Romans 12:3-8; I Corinthians 12:4-11; 28; Ephesians 4:1-16).

Acts 20:31 "Watch"

(I Corinthians 16:13; Colossians 4:2; I Thessalonians 5:6, 10).

"warn every one"

(Romans 15:14; I Corinthians 4:14; Colossians 1:28; 3:16; I Thessalonians 5:12, 14; II Thessalonians 3:15).

"night and day"

(I Thessalonians 2:9; 3:10; II Thessalonians 3:8; I Timothy 5:5; II Timothy 1:3).

Acts 20:32 "I commend you to God"

(Romans 16:25-27; I Thessalonians 3:11-13; 5:23).

"which is able to build you up"

(I Corinthians 3:9-17; II Corinthians 10:8: 13:10; Ephesians 2:19-22).

"and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified"

(II Corinthians 9:8; Ephesians 1:14; 8:20; Philippians 4:19; Colossians 1:12; 3:24).

Acts 20:33 "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel."

(I Corinthians 9:3-18; II Corinthians 11:7-11; 12:13; I Thessalonians 2:5).

Acts 20:34 "these hands have ministered unto my necessities"

(I Corinthians 4:12; I Thessalonians 2:9; 4:11, 12; II Thessalonians 3:7-12).

The list could be multiplied, especially through comparisons of such characteristically Pauline words as "profitable," "bearing witness," "Holy Ghost," "bonds and affliction," "watch," "be on guard," "grace," and "remember."

Throughout his speech, therefore, Paul speaks in a style that is clear and intelligible to his audience because he speaks correctly and chooses words, phrases, and ideas that have long been familiar to them through his ministry.

3. Simplicity of Grammar. The sermon of the Apostle Paul to the Ephesians is contained in 18 verses in the King James version. In these 18 verses there are 13 sentences, two of them simple and the rest complex. One sentence of 92 words takes up two verses. Yet neither of these sentences are difficult to understand. In fact, though most of Paul's sentences are characteristically complex, they are nevertheless obviously clear in meaning. The complexity of most of his sentences gives the few simple ones he speaks extra impact. In this message, the simple ones are, "For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God"

(verse 27), and "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel" (verse 33).

Connectives which the Apostle uses include "and" (most frequently used), "that," "neither," "so that," "which," "For," "But," "Therefore," "how that," and "yea." These transition words add a cumulative force without reducing the perspicuity of his speech. Sequence and repetition of thought also help the listeners to understand easily. *Correctness* in word form does too. Paul does not depend upon simple sentences for perspicuity, then, but seeks to make his message understood by the use of other elucidating factors.

Direct discourse. The powerful messages of Saint Paul are in the style of oratory that speaks of face-to-face direct encounter. The tone of his speech is animated, directed to the occasion, dynamic, actual, and immediate. There is a dramatic element in his pleas, testimonies, challenges, exclamations, and oaths. He moves freely from one sub-topic to another, speaking in his own name and yet in the power of the Spirit. It is this sense of divine unction and action dwelling in and working through him that makes his speeches distinctive. He does not speak in a special holy language, or with a "Thus saith the Lord"; rather, he uses the vernacular speech, and his own personality, and makes it clear when he is quoting the Lord Jesus. He does, however, make scriptural allusions without stating them as such.

The thrust of Paul's direct discourse is seen in his use of first and second pronouns. In the 18 verses of his message he uses 28 first-person pronouns, and 18 second-person pronouns. Paul also achieves a blunt and forceful effect through their emphatic use. By high-lighting certain pronouns through repetition and word order, he stresses the direct and personal involvement of both speaker and listener in what he is saying. This emphasis appears in such phrases as "You yourselves know . . . after what manner I have been with you" (verse 18); "bound in the spirit, I go unto Jerusalem" (verse 22); "I know that ye shall see my face no more, ye all among whom I have gone preaching" (verse 25); "the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers" (verse 28); "I know this, that grievous wolves shall enter among you after my departing" (verse 29); "Also of your own selves will men arise" (verse 30); "Yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities" (verse 34). The underlined words reflect the special emphasis of the Greek text. Many other personal pronouns appear in the sermon, but these are the ones that Paul particularly emphasizes in order to give a direct and hortatory spirit to his message. Through this medium of perspicuity he seeks to secure a response from his listeners.

In summary, Paul makes himself clearly intelligible by using the ideas, and the vocabulary, and phrases which his audience have already come to understand and to associate with him. His correct word forms, logical sequence of thought and clear transition, along with a style that speaks of face-to-face direct confrontation, all bring his concepts easily within the grasp of those who are listening.

Although Saint Paul's sermon to the Ephesians is brief in its record, we still find instances of his use of *ornamentation*. He uses allusion, visual imagery, metaphor, metonomy, repetition, example, and illustration, as well as progression, suspense, and climax.

The Apostle's *allusions* give impact by reminding listeners of details and circumstances surrounding incidents recalled but not elaborated upon by him. He thus implies much more than he states, adding emotional connotations not openly expressed. His allusion to the watchman of Israel indicates how seriously he takes his charge to "testify the gospel of the grace of God." He recalls that the blood of the unwarned wicked who dies in his sins will be required at the hand of the slothful watchman. He would not be negligent himself, and does not want the Ephesian elders to be.

The Apostle's allusion to finishing his course is a reference to the runners of the Greek games whom he probably watched as a boy. He alludes to the runners because they, like Paul, forget "those things which are behind" and "reach forth unto those things which are before," pressing "toward the mark for the prize."[129] He would fight a good fight and finish his course, having kept the faith.[130] He runs that he might obtain the crown.[131]

Paul also makes allusion to the sacrifice of Christ, whereby He purchased the Church with His Own blood.[132]

Paul uses ornamentation through visual imagery. He refers to being "bound" in the spirit, teaching publicly, going "from house to house," and describes Jews "lying in wait," for him, "tears" (twice), "bonds and afflictions," finishing "the course," "among whom I have gone preaching," "wolves," "draw away disciples," "the weak," "the Lord Jesus."

The Apostle uses metaphor when he describes the false teachers who will come as "grievous wolves" to "enter in among you." These wolves, he asserts, will ravage the sheep, "not sparing the flock," The overseers, as shepherds, are to "feed" these sheep. Here is colorful language, picturing in terms of familiar scenes the truths he desires to convey. Paul designs to move as well as to convince, and to this end he employs picturesque imagery. "The pictorial effect and the appeal to imagery contribute in no small measure" to emotional value.[133] These "fierce wolves" or false teachers are described as savage beasts because of the great damage they do. For this reason Christ warned, "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravenous wolves."[134]

The Apostle uses metonomy when he says the elders "will see my face" no more, and throughout his message he uses *examples and illustrations* of his own unselfish service and concern, which set a pattern for his audience to follow. "The greatest aid to vividness in persuasion is concreteness of statement," Baker states, and this concreteness includes examples and illustrations of all kinds.[135] Paul's emotional appeal to what his hands have done for the Ephesians is one example of his concreteness of statement. Furthermore, the fact that he served and warned the Ephesians with tears is a truth the Apostle emphasizes by *repetition*, another rhetorical principle.

During the course of his message the Apostle employs *progression* from an opening note of courtesy, denoting mutual understanding, to a reminder of his own character and behavior in the face of external trouble and internal temptation, to the frank and urgent plea that his listeners conduct themselves according to the pattern he has portrayed. He adds *suspense* by describing the witness of the Holy Ghost concerning what awaits him at Jerusalem, and by a description of the false teachers and ambitious leaders who will arise to trouble the church. His *climax* is a powerful reminder of the words of the Lord Jesus Himself, Who, in one sentence, summarizes all of the principles which Paul has sought to communicate, and to exemplify by his own life.

Besides the four virtues of good style, which Cicero discussed, the famous Roman orator also stressed *versatil-*

ity. Paul exemplifies versatility because he is a master of all three styles of delivery. He uses them as occasion and subject-matter demand, and we find them in his message to the elders at Miletus.

In De Orator, Cicero closes his discussion of delivery by observing that good delivery implies that what the orator is saying seems to come from the heart.[136] In giving his message to the Ephesian elders, Paul does speak from the heart. He might be tempted, in the urgency and fervency of his emotions, to speak in the grand style alone. However, he is as wise as Saint Augustine's later words in realizing that "the subdued style alone can be tolerated more readily for a period of time than the grand style alone. . . . if the grand style must be used for a protracted time, it should not be used alone."[137] Thus, the Apostle begins with the subdued style, for he is concerned with offering proof.[138] The subdued style of speaking is appropriate when "The thing discussed does not need verbal ornaments nor motions of the affections to persuade, but evidence as proof.[139] At the beginning of his discourse the Apostle presents the manner in which he has conducted himself before his audience as proof of his sincerity and the depth of his love for them. This proof will serve as the foundation upon which he will build his exhortations and warnings.

Paul's delivery rises to the moderate style as he discloses the disquieting, even frightening witness of the Holy

Spirit to what awaits him in Jerusalem. The crescendo continues to rise to the grand style as he exclaims:

> But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.[140]

From this point his speech maintains fire and momentum. He next speaks in the moderate style with its ornamentation as he rouses the elders to his warnings, using figures of speech to describe the false teachers and selfish perverters who are to come. The moderate style, according to Cicero, is appropriate when one condemns something, and Paul is condemning already the trouble these "wolves" will bring as they seek to ravage the sheep. The Apostle uses verbs as a source of energy, averaging three verbs per verse.

However, it is Paul's ultimate and fervent desire to persuade those who ought to do something to do it. Therefore, his speech rises again to the conceptions and fervor of the grand style, for this desire "should be spoken in the grand manner, in a way appropriate to the persuasion of their minds."[141] The force and charm of emotional appeal in the grand style is a chief characteristic of this speech. Classical theorists recognized the psychological connection between the orator's feeling of emotions and his effectively exciting them in the audience. When Paul proclaims that his one ambition is to finish his course with joy, no doubt that same desire rises in the hearts of his listeners;

when he exhorts, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His Own blood"[142] no doubt their desires and purpose rise to meet and match this challenge, also.

Delivery, according to Cicero,[143] includes style, emotions, gesture, and voice attuned to the situation and time. Paul's affectionate and fervent emotions and style are a large part of his delivery in this situation. We are not told that he made any gestures at the beginning of his message, but near the end of it he uses his hands as well as his voice to convey his earnest pleadings: "Yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me."[144] He would move his audience to an equally diligent and earnest service, and so maintains the grand style. There may be tears in his eyes and on his cheeks as he reaches his climax with one last burning exhortation, and as he supports the forceful emotions of his spirit with the equally fervent and eloquent words of Jesus, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."[145]

This message rises and falls with the ardent, zealous emotions of the speaker. Paul's address is evidence of his versatility in blending emotions and style with appropriate delivery. He captivates the minds and hearts of his listeners. Both Cicero and Augustine point out that an eloquent message may prevent applause, or applauding voices, "by its own weight," but that such a speech may "bring forth tears," and such tears will prevent any other response.[146] The elders of Ephesus heard the Apostle "willingly, intelligently," and therefore "obediently."[147] They were changed in that they knew what they did not know before;[148] and they showed these effects of Paul's eloquence with tears. Such tears may have momentarily hushed the willing assent that lay in their hearts and will, and which was later evidenced so greatly. In any case, Paul was successful in his goal which comprehends Cicero's three aims of the orator: "to instruct, to please, and to win," . . . for "to teach is a necessity, to please is a sweetness, to persuade is a victory."[149] "For it is the universal office of eloquence, in any of these three styles, to speak in a manner leading to persuasion; and the end of eloquence is to persuade of that which you are speaking."[150]

Analysis of Pathos and Ethos

Did Paul's address to the elders of Ephesus reveal pathos and ethos?

This speech ranks perhaps as foremost of all in earnest, sincere, and impassioned eloquence. Cicero's theory did not confine emotion to any one particular part of the speech, and Paul does not either. Like the Roman orator, he combines pathos and ethos with style and delivery. George Pierce Baker, in his Principles of Argumentation, p. 362, asserts that examples and illustrations are indispensable in excitation. At Miletus, Paul uses examples and illustrations from his own life, and thereby accomplishes excitation with the emotions at their highest because of his parting.

Speaking in his own person in De Oratore, Cicero says that in all his pathetic passages it was not so much his talent as his capacity for experiencing the feelings he expressed that accounted for his success. Hence, he gives special emphasis to the rhetorical appeal to the emotions, success in which, he holds, constitutes the chief excellence of the orator.[151] His main emphasis is on the necessity for the orator to feel the emotions he tries to arouse. Paul reveals his emotions of love, sorrow, earnestness, sympathy, and religious zeal when he speaks to the Ephesians; hence, he arouses these emotions in the hearts of the listening elders. His ethical appeal is interwoven with the pathetic appeal throughout the whole message, and is not a thing apart from the logical arguments of the Apostle, either. His service has been an ethical means of expressing love. Evidences of his probity of character, competence, and goodwill--qualities Aristotle associated with ethical proof--are easily traced in the speech. Paul presents his own transparent, well-known conduct as evidence of his virtue. Actually, only his deliberate opponents would doubt the competence of a man who had turned "the world upside down." This Apostle had silenced mobs, won both the rich and the poor, and raised up congregations like that at Ephesus wherever he travelled. Further, as verbal ethical proof, Paul declares that his ministry is one he has "received of the Lord Jesus" so that he is an ambassador of Heaven. This authoritative note is the corollary of the competence he displays in argument. The Christian counterpart of the Aristotelian "goodwill" is love. This, Paul displayed in abundance verbally as well as through other forms of conduct. He calls the elders "brethren," revealing a love and concern that confirms their trust in him. In the words of Thonssen and Baird:

> It is apparent that the distinction between emotional and ethical proof is not always clear; and in some instances it may be virtually nonexistent. Ethos and pathos have, indeed, much in common. . . . The speaker who establishes his own moral integrity . . . is unquestionably using both ethical and pathetic proof. He is establishing credence in his own probity and character, and at the same time is predisposing the minds of the hearers toward the readier acceptance of his cause.[152]

Generally a speaker focuses attention upon his probity, competence, and goodwill when he associates himself or his message and cause with what is virtuous and elevated.[153]

Paul's use of his own ethos as a speaker, his use of logic, and his use of the authoritative, tender presentation of his conscientious example as a bondslave of Christ, all exert an emotional impact upon the audience. Apart from the subject matter itself, his figures and allusions also combine to exert an emotional impact. Phillips Brooks commends such preaching that is "strong in its appeal to authority, wide in its grasp of truth, convincing in its appeal to reason, and earnest in its address to the conscience and heart."[154]

Paul appeals to the desire for satisfaction, to the emotions of fear and sorrow, to logic, to integrity, to the desire for self-preservation and social approval, to religious zeal and to the emotions of gratitude and love. Thus, says Sclater, he plays upon the whole of the ascending scale from fear to love, and "it is doubtless best to touch mostly upon the strings at the upper end of the emotive scale, remembering 'the expulsive power of a new affection,' and knowing that, though reason may fail to change a man, if you touch the level of his affections, you move his world."[155] Like Cicero, Paul was aware that:

> Mankind makes far more determinations through hatred, or love, or desire, or anger, or grief, or joy, or hope, or fear, or error, or some other affection of mind, than from regard to truth, or any settled maxim, or principles of right, or judicial form, or adherence to the laws.[156]

In the early part of his speech, Paul reveals his satisfaction in carrying on the work of Christ. In the next few verses following, he admonishes of the difficulties in carrying out the task. This appeal to fear is particularly effective because he has already shown the reward of satisfaction involved. Then too, there is the fear of consequences if the elders don't do their part. It is wise to emphasize "what men desire, and this is ordinarily the better note to strike; but we must not forget that men still live much under the dominion of fear."[157] Any appeal to the basic instincts is always good in persuasion. Fear is included in William James' list of instincts above the infant level.

Since Paul's message is built totally around his own example and the significance of that example, it becomes a delicate matter, perhaps even a little awkward. With such an emphasis, there is the danger that the Apostle might not speak in such a way as to convince the elders that his unselfish behavior is the evidence of his abiding affection for them. At the same time, however, he must speak with sufficient forcefulness so that they will be impelled to heed his warnings. The Apostle, therefore, infuses his message with a spirit of fervent love and at the same time, of strong admonition. For Paul, strong emotion was the inevitable corollary of strong convictions. Thus, pathos and logos are naturally associated, and intertwined with the ethos of the man himself.

Paul reminds the elders of his love for them through language which emphasizes the utter thoroughness of his activity among them. He cared for them so much that he fully and completely extended himself on their behalf. He served with "all" humility. He did not shrink from "anything" that was profitable. On the contrary, he declared everything ("repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ"), to everyone ("both Jews and Greeks"), everywhere ("publicly, and from house to house"), in every way ("serving" . . . "teaching" . . . "testifying" . . . "shewing"). Moreover, he is free from the blood of "all" men, for he declared the "whole" counsel of God, and did not cease "night and day" for three years to admonish "each" one with tears. He coveted "no one's" material wealth; rather, he showed them "always" how to toil unselfishly for the sake of the ministry. At no time does the Apostle hesitate to remind his hearers that he never enriched himself at their expense. He did not accept financial support, though entitled to it. He served completely because he cared so deeply. Here is appeal to a whole gamut of emotions, including gratitude and sorrow, fear for Paul, and religious zeal. Absolutely primary is the appeal to religious beliefs and to the love existing between Paul and the believers.

The Apostle protects the spirit of love he is conveying by being as modest in the presentation of his example as his theme will permit. He wants to avoid any assertive superiority or overbearing boastfulness. To do this, he describes his activity in negative terms--"I did not shrink from anything that was profitable"; "neither count I my life dear"; "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God"; "I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears"; "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel." All of these ideas could have been asserted in a bolder, more positive manner, but the negative and more modest equivalents avoid offense and preserve the spirit of love.

Paul further shows his love for the elders by refraining from any mention of the gift he is taking to Jerusalem. It is obvious from the Corinthian and Roman correspondence that the collection is very much on his mind. It is even the reason for his journey to Jerusalem. But he says nothing of this in his sermon; he only mentions that he is bound in the spirit as he heads for the city. This omission may be illusory; it is possible that the full text of Paul's sermon made mention of the gift and that the reference was merely overlooked in Luke's subsequent and condensed report. On the other hand, the silence may have been original, and deliberate on Paul's part. The churches of Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia are explicitly mentioned in the epistles as participating in the collection.[158] But nothing is said of any funds from the churches of Asia. It may be that the Asian Christians for one reason or another did not share in his benevolent work. If so, the omission of any embarrassing reference to the matter is explained by Paul's concern for the feelings of those before him, and by his desire to thoroughly communicate a spirit of continual affection.

Paul also strives for an atmosphere of strong admonition in order that the elders will be spurred to action. He achieves blunt and direct forcefulness through the use of direct discourse, as has already been discussed, and through the use of asyndeton and solemn expressions.

Asyndeton is the unconnected paratactic use of words and sentences.[159] According to Black, this particular construction:

> is, on the whole, contrary to the spirit of the Greek language. Most Greek sentences are linked by a connecting particle, and, where asyndeton is found, it is generally employed with rhetorical effect, especially in admonition.[160]

Asyndeton, therefore, is a syntactical device which effectively produces a tone of admonition. And since this is the mood Paul desires, it is not surprising that he deliberately and frequently employs this construction in his sermon to the elders. Asyndeton can be found in verses 29, 33, 34, and 35; in each instance it is rhetorically effective in creating the proper spirit for Paul's message.[161]

Paul also achieves a spirit of strong admonition by the very solemnity of his expressions. The vocabulary he uses stresses the significance and urgency of his message. Words and phrases such as "plots of the Jews," "bound in the spirit," "bonds and affliction," "free from the blood of all," "did not shrink," "take heed," "grievous wolves," "not sparing the flock," "to draw away disciples," "Therefore watch," and "remember," draw attention to the seriousness of the moment and to the need for a resolute and determined response. His appeals, likewise, are made in light of the most awesome considerations: he reminds the elders that the Holy Spirit has specifically appointed them as shepherds of the flock, to give protection and oversight; if they fail in their duty, God's flock will be ravaged and scattered. Thus, the Apostle places the full weight of responsibility on the elders in order to compel them to a zealous vigilance. The Apostle is well aware that by nature, men are at odds with one another. By linking his destiny with that of every Christian, by throwing a bond of love about them, Paul manifests an empathy, an identification, that makes men not only trust him, but be ready to die for him. Paul appeals to the elders to emulate him; he appeals to their integrity, to their religious zeal, to their instinct for self-preservation, and to their desire for social approval, for it would be a disgrace to have their flock ravaged. The second constituent of ethical proof, competence, is manifested throughout the whole sermon by this sure, authoritative touch, admonition and practical counsel. Strong admonition as well as fervent love encourages acceptance of the message. Paul evinces an intelligent understanding of the character of his audience and disposes his hearers in his behalf.[162]

It is doubtful that any rhetorical manual exists containing a better example of ethos than this speech of Paul's. How tenderly and delicately he reminds his hearers of his behavior before their eyes: His courage, sincerity, and love have warmed their hearts many times, and his reminder of these sacred memories warms hearts again.

George Campbell once wrote that persuasion has its "marvelous efficacy in rousing the passions, and by some secret, sudden, and inexplicable association, awakening all the tenderest emotions of the heart."[163] That Paul is the object of the tenderest emotions of his listeners' hearts is made obvious by the elders' choice of words for never seeing him again. When Paul discloses that they will "see" his face no more (verse 25), he uses δράω, a word which denotes the physical act in general, "seeing as sense-perception."[164] But when the elders respond with sorrow because they will "see his face no more" (verse 38), *they* use θεάομαι, a term that suggests an "attentive regard," a "longer, more warm and intimate" look. By instinctively changing Paul's neutral word for "seeing" to one that "lays stress on the element of love and intimacy in the regarding," they reveal their great affection for him.[165]

Hence, it is possible that in this message of Paul's we have one of the best examples of *ethos* (including not only the character of the speaker, but also the character of the audience and of the message as well) in ancient oratory. The Apostle "relies upon authority derived from his personal experience," and "creates the impression of being completely sincere in his undertaking."[166] It cannot be too strongly affirmed that he never conveys ideas merely; he also conveys himself. According to Saint Augustine, "The life of the speaker has greater weight in determining whether he is obediently heard than any grandness of eloquence."[167] Hence, the Apostle writes to Timothy, "Be thou an example,"[168] and Quintilian, while absorbing the whole tradition of classic rhetorical theory, adds that the first essential for the perfect orator is "that he should be a good man. Therefore, I demand of him not only outstanding gifts of speech, but all the excellencies of character as well."[169]

Finally, Paul certainly fulfills the essential attributes which George Boss lists for determining whether a "leader-communicator" should be thought of as being "charismatic." Attributes belonging to such a person, according to Boss, are: a "'gift of grace,' special leadership qualities, an inspiring message, and successful results." Attributes presumably possessed by such a leader should be, Boss says, "'high status,' 'a shared history' with followers, a 'mission-crusade,' and a 'crisis.'" Each attribute creates and interacts with the other and derives value from the needs and aspirations of listener-followers.[170]

By "gift of grace" is meant an extension of the concept of ethos, "a certain quality of the individual personality by which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with . . . at least specifically exceptional powers and qualities."[171] Paul was and has been recognized as undeniably the recipient of divine empowerment and a man of exceptional qualities.

The "special qualities of leadership" must include an audience of faithful and supportive followers or disciples, a heroic spirit, a messianic appeal, and "extraordinary skill in utterance."[172] Anyone who reads the life and messages of Saint Paul will agree that he fulfills this criterion.

An "inspiring message," according to Boss, infers memorable communication, and nonverbal as well as verbal behavior which "stimulates followers to transcendent efforts."[173] Paul fulfilled this criterion to such an extent that Luke took pains to record the Apostle's memorable communication, and the continuance and expansion of the Church testified to the transcendent efforts of Paul's followers.

By "successful results," Boss means achievement which is clearly evident; and his "high status," infers a place of power from which the leader will be expected to produce miracles of some kind.[174] Paul's success was evident in multiplied disciples and churches, while physical miracles are recorded of him, besides the supreme miracle of the transformation of a Jewish sect into a world religion.

"A shared history" with followers includes a very intimate "sense of community," common convictions with proof of faithfulness to them, and "identification" in the Burkean sense.[175] Paul's message at Miletus and the reaction of his audience to him and to his example exemplifies all of these.

By "mission-crusade" is meant a selfless, sacred enterprise inseparable from the leader-communicator, that can mean "the sudden eruption into history of quite new forces, often linked to quite new ideas."[176] The Gospel of Jesus Christ which Paul called "my Gospel" was that sacred enterprise and that new force which suddenly erupted into history. Both the Apostle and his followers demonstrated selflessness in communicating this Gospel to the point of martyrdom.

A "crisis" as discussed by Boss infers leadership that is "a uniquely personal response to a crisis in human experience."[177] Paul believed that men would be either saved or judged on the basis of whether or not they responded, as he had, to the crisis in human experience brought about by the birth, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, the Christ. Paul preached in order that men might know about that crisis and might respond to it aright. The Apostle's ministry was his own uniquely personal response to his crisis experience on the Damascus road, when he met the Savior.

Surely in the period of Paul the Apostle's preaching, and in the ages since, there was, and has been, none to excel his personal and dynamic "charisma."

Summary

Paul's sermon to the Christians in Acts 20 takes place in the city of Miletus as the Apostle is on his way to Jerusalem with a collection for the Christians. Prompted by his own uncertain future, and by his affection for those among whom he has labored so long, Paul summons the elders of the

Ephesian church for a farewell moment together. His message to them is one of exhortation, based upon his own example and his coming departure. The Apostle pleads with the elders to be on guard for themselves and for all the flock. They must guard the flock against the external danger of false teachers by means of a diligent and thorough service to the church; and by means of a spirit of complete self-denial, they must guard themselves against the internal temptation to profit from the ministry. The immediate response to the Apostle's sermon is one of great sorrow at the thought of not seeing Paul again. However, the elders also respond with a prolonged and zealous obedience: for years to come they successfully guard the flock from error and themselves from covetousness.

The theme of Paul's speech is appropriate to the spirit of the occasion of farewell, for he reflects on a long, intimate association, warns of troubles in their separate futures, and exhorts to imitation. His theme is also an appropriate one for an audience of Christian elders bearing the responsibilities of the church.

The structure of Paul's sermon is brief and closely reasoned, based upon the logic of demonstration through self-revelation rather than that achieved by links in a chain of reasoning. He first speaks of his own response to external trouble and internal temptation, and then exhorts the elders to follow his example. He uses personal examples as supporting material in order to give his listeners a clear pattern to follow, in the absence of written material on Christian deportment. He also uses his personal example because of its persuasive potential, knowing the extent of the elders' affection and regard for him. In conclusion, he reminds them of the words of Jesus which are the summation with power of all he has been saying. The full climax and impact of his message is not achieved until these last words, presenting an exalted principle, are spoken.

Paul uses the Ciceronian topics of distribution of past and present, and of consistency, and the Topic questions of rhetoric: "What" "When" "Where" "How" and "Why?" He also employs Aristotle's three primary modes of persuasion. As a deliberative orator in the classical tradition, he speaks of what is praiseworthy and right.

Paul's message exemplifies all four of the Ciceronian virtues of style: propriety, correctness, perspicuity, and ornamentation. He adapts himself to his audience by using the characteristic words, phrases, and ideas which they have come to understand and associate with him. He demonstrates versatility as he employs all three of the classical styles of delivery; however, the force and charm of emotional appeal in the grand style is a chief characteristic of this speech. His style is one of direct encounter, dynamic, immediate, dramatic. He speaks in the vernacular and in his own name and character. He successfully achieves his goal which comprehends Cicero's three aims of the orator: to instruct, to please, and to win.

Paul's ethical appeal is interwoven with the pathetic appeal, and is not apart from the logical arguments of the Apostle. Like Cicero, he combines pathos and ethos with style and delivery. The Apostle appeals to the desire for satisfaction, to the emotions of fear and sorrow, to logic, to integrity, to the desire for self-preservation and social approval, to religious zeal, and to the emotions of gratitude and love. His virtue, competence, and goodwill are evident as he conveys a spirit of love, zeal, and strong admonition. He never conveys ideas alone, but also conveys himself. It is possible that in this message of Paul's we have one of the best examples of ethos in ancient oratory. He also exemplifies the modern rhetorical concept of "charisma."

FOOTNOTES

[1] Henry Alford, The Greek New Testament (Boston: Lee and Shepherd, 1883), II, p. 13.

[2] Richard B. Rackham, "The Acts of the Apostles," Oxford Commentaries (London: Methuen and Company, 1901), p. 3.

[3] Albert Barnes, Notes on the Acts of the Apostles (London: Blackie and Son, n.d.), III, p. 275.

[4] II Corinthians 11:28.

[5] William Smith, A New Standard Bible Dictionary (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1962), p. 179.

[6] I Corinthians 16:1-4.

[7] I Corinthians 16:5, 6.

[8] Frederic Henry Chase, The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1902), p. 258.

[9] Acts 19:21.

[10] Acts 20:1-3.

[11] Acts 9:22-24.

[12] Acts 13:45.

[13] Acts 14:1-7; 19.

[14] Acts 17:4-13.

[15] Acts 18:5-13, and 19:9.

[16] Romans 15:23-27.

[17] Romans 15:30, 31.

[18] Acts 20:3.

[19] W. M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen (3rd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949), p. 287.

[20] Acts 20:3-15.

[21] Acts 20:16.

[22] Acts 19:10, 20.

[23] Acts 19:26.

[24] Acts 20:16.

[25] Acts 20:17.

[26] Charles F. Pfeiffer and Howard F. Vos, The Wycliffe Historical Geography of Bible Lands (Chicago: Moody Press, 1967), p. 370.

[27] Acts 20:20, 21.

[28] I Corinthians 15:30.

[29] Acts 19:1; 20:1.

[30] Acts 19:8-10.

[31] Acts 19:33, 34.

[32] II Corinthians 1:8-10.

[33] II Corinthians 11:24-27.

[34] I Corinthians 4:9-13.

[35] I Corinthians 15:32.

[36] Acts 21:27, 28.

[37] Acts 20:23.

[38] Acts 21:4.

[39] Acts 21:10, 11.

[40] Acts 21:13.

[41] Acts 20:24.

[42] Philippians 1:20-24.

[43] Acts 19:21; Romans 15:24-28.

[44] I Timothy 1:3; 3:14; 4:13; II Timothy 1:16, 18.

[45] William Hendriksen, Exposition of the Pastoral Epistles, New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1957), p. 39.

[46] Ezekiel 3:17, 19, 21; see also Ezekiel 33:1-6.

[47] Acts 20:28, 29.

[48] Acts 20:30.

[49] Acts 20:31.

[50] Acts 20:33.

[51] Matthew 6:19, 20.

[52] Luke 12:33, 34. See also James 5:1-3; Joshua 7:31; Judges 14:12, 13; II Kings 5:5, 22, 23; Nehemiah 7:70-72; Job 27:16, 17.

[53] F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles; the Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary (London: The Tyndale Press, 1951), p. 382.

[54] Acts 18:1-3, 18-20.

[55] I Timothy 5:23.

[56] I Corinthians 9:14.

[57] Galatians 6:6.

[58] Romans 15:27.

[59] I Corinthians 9:12.

[60] I Corinthians 9:18.

[61] II Thessalonians 3:8, 9.

[62] Acts 20:35.

[63] Ephesians 4:28 and Romans 12:13.

[64] Romans 14:1.

[65] Romans 15:1.

[66] I Corinthians 9:22; I Thessalonians 5:14.

[67] Acts 20:35.

[68] Acts 20:32.

[69] Ephesians 5:5.

[70] Colossians 3:23, 24.

[71] Acts 20:32.

[72] Acts 20:36-38.

[73] R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles (Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1944), p. 857.

[74] I Timothy 1:3.

[75] Henriksen, p. 43.

[76] I Timothy 1:4.

[77] I Timothy 6:20.

[78] II Timothy 2:23.

[79] Fenton John Anthony Hort, Judaistic Christianity (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1904), pp. 130-46.

[80] II Timothy 2:14.

[81] II Timothy 3:2-8.

[82] Hort, pp. 140-143, 210-13.

[83] Revelation 2:2; cf. I Timothy 2:7; II Timothy 3:13; II Corinthians 11:13.

[84] I Timothy 6:4.

[85] I Timothy 6:5.

[86] II Timothy 2:16.

[87] II Timothy 2:17.

[88] I Timothy 1:5-7.

[89] I Timothy 1:19, 20.

[90] II Timothy 1:15.

[91] II Timothy 2:17, 18.

[92] I Timothy 4:1-3.

[93] William L. Lane, "I Tim. iv. 1-3. An Early Instance of Over-Realized Eschatology?" New Testament Studies, XI (January, 1965), 166.

[94] I Timothy 4:6, 7.

[95] II Timothy 3:16.

[96] II Timothy 1:13, 14.

[97] II Timothy 4:2.

[98] II Timothy 2:24-26.

[99] I John 2:19.

[100] Irenaeus, Against Heresies. The Anti-Nicene Fathers. Vol. I; The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), 3. 3. 4; cf. 2. 22. 5; 3. 1. 1.

[101] Revelation 2:2.

[102] Revelation 2:6.

[103] Revelation 2:14.

[104] Irenaeus, 1. 26. 3. For a fuller description of their beliefs and activity, see the article by H. Cowan, "Nicolaitans," A Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. III: Kir-Pleiades, ed. by James Hastings (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1900), pp. 547, 548.

[105] Ignatius of Antioch, Ephesians, ed., Robert H. Grant (Camden: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1966), 6. 2.

[106] I Timothy 3:3, 8.

[107] I Timothy 6:5.

[108] I Timothy 6:8.

[109] I Timothy 6:9, 10. Demas is one who fell into such a snare. See II Timothy 4:10.

[110] I Timothy 5:17, 18.

[111] Moses Hadas, ed., The Basic Works of Cicero (New York: Random House, 1951), p. 256.

[112] Lester Thonssen and Craig Baird, Speech Criticism: The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948), p. 334.

[113] James A. Winans and H. H. Hudson, A First Course in Public Speaking (New York: The Century Company, 1925), p. 7.

[114] Longinus(?) On Great Writing (On the Sublime), trans. G. M. A. Grubb, The Library of Liberal Arts (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1957), 1. 10. 17.

[115] Charles W. Carter and Ralph Earle, The Acts of the Apostles, The Evangelical Commentary, ed. by George Allen Turner (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959), p. 310.

[116] Aristotle, The Art of Rhetoric, trans. John Henry Freeze, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), 1. 2. 4.

[117] This is Cohen's conclusion after surveying the experimental data. Arthur R. Cohen, Attitude Change and Social Influence, with a forward by Leon Festinger and Phillip Zimbardo (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964), p. 29.

For other reviews of the literature dealing with this phenomenon, see Kenneth Andersen and Theodore Clevenger, Jr., "A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos," Speech Monographs, 30 (June, 1963), 59-78; and James C. McCroskey, An Introduction to Rhetorical Communication; the Theory and Practice of Public Speaking (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), pp. 58-78.

[118] Wayne C. Minnick, The Art of Persuasion (2nd ed.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), p. 161.

[119] Winans and Hudson, A First Course in Public Speaking, p. 147.

[120] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, trans. Harry Caplan, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), I. 8; Cicero De Inventione, trans. H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), I. 22.

[121] Cicero *De Oratore*, trans. E. W. Sutton, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948), 2. 334; Cf. Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory*, trans. J. S. Watson (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1903), III. 8. 1.

[122] Longinus (?) *On Great Writing (On the Sublime)*, p. 12.

[123] Longinus (?) p. 12.

[124] Horatio B. Hackett, *A Commentary on the Original Text of the Acts of the Apostles* (London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1877), p. 260.

[125] Archibald Thomas Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament: The Acts of the Apostles* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930), III, p. 346.

[126] Joseph Addison Alexander, *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, Classic Commentary Library (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1956), p. 701.

[127] Frederic Henry Chase, *The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles* (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1902), p. 290.

[128] Acts 1:1.

[129] Philippians 3:13, 14.

[130] II Timothy 4:7, 8.

[131] I Corinthians 9:24-27.

[132] Romans 3:25.

[133] Thonssen and Baird, *Speech Criticism*, p. 372.

[134] Matthew 7:15.

[135] Gordon P. Baker, *The Witness of the Prophets* (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948), p. 64.

[136] Cicero *De Oratore*, 3. 15. 27. Cf. Quintilian, 11. 3. 123.

[137] Saint Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, Trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1958), IV. 22. 159.

[138] Saint Augustine, IV. 21. 155; Cf. Cicero De Oratore, 29. 101.

[139] Saint Augustine, IV. 21. 154.

[140] Acts 20:24.

[141] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, IV. 19. 145.

[142] Acts 20:28.

[143] Cicero De Oratore, 29. 101.

[144] Acts 20:34.

[145] Acts 20:35.

[146] Saint Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, IV. 24. 160.

[147] Saint Augustine, IV. 26. 164.

[148] Saint Augustine, IV. 24. 161.

[149] Cicero De Oratore, 21. 69.

[150] Saint Augustine De Doctrina Christiana, trans. J. F. Shaw, ed. Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), IV. 25. 161.

[151] Cicero De Oratore, pp. 120, 130, 132; Cicero Brutus, trans. G. L. Hendrickson, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), pp. 89, 279.

[152] Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, pp. 386, 387.

[153] Thonssen and Baird, pp. 386, 387.

[154] Phillips Brooks, Lectures on Preaching (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), p. 132.

[155] J. R. P. Sclater, The Public Worship of God (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1927), pp. 83, 84.

[156] Cicero De Oratore, II, p. 42.

[157] James H. Winans and H. H. Hudson, A First Course in Public Speaking, p. 153.

[158] I Corinthians 16:1; II Corinthians 8:1; Romans 15:26.

[159] F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, a trans. and revision of the ninth-tenth German ed., incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 239.

[160] Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3rd ed.; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 55, 56.

[161] Black, p. 59.

[162] Thonssen & Baird, *Speech Criticism*, p. 361.

[163] George Campbell, *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (London: W. Strahan; T. Cadell, in the Strand: and W. Creech, in Edinburgh, 1783); copyright 1965 by Southern Illinois University Press), p. 375.

[164] Wilhelm Michaelis, "ὁραω," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. V: *Ξ--Πα*, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967), p. 317.

[165] Michaelis, pp. 344, 345.

[166] See Thonssen and Baird, *Speech Criticism*, p. 386.

[167] Saint Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, IV. 27. 164.

[168] I Timothy 4:12.

[169] Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria*, trans. H. E. Butler, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), I. pr. 9.

[170] George P. Boss, "Essential Attributes of the Concept of Charisma," *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 61, No. 3 (Spring, 1976), 300-313.

[171] Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: The Free Press, 1964), p. 358.

[172] Boss, pp. 304, 305.

[173] Boss, pp. 305, 306.

[174] Boss, pp. 308, 309; 311, 312.

[175] Boss, pp. 307, 308.

[176] Peter L. Berger, "Charisma and Religious Innovations: Social Location of Israelite Prophecy," The American Sociological Review, 28 (1963), 949.

[177] Reinhard Bendix, Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait (Garden City: Doubleday, 1962), p. 300, cited in Boss, p. 311.

CHAPTER VIII

THE RHETORIC OF MICAH

There are scholars who feel that Micah demonstrates "less originality and less force" than are exhibited by the earlier prophets Amos and Hosea.[1] Micah's importance, however, is not decreased by the assumption that when he is compared with Amos and Hosea, he has a "slightly lower level both of thought and power."[2] On the other hand, many would disagree with the questionable judgment that he has "none of the simplicity of Amos,"[3] and "none of the originality of Hosea."[4] An objective analysis of his style and appeals will demonstrate that Micah is not mediocre. The marks of his lofty stature are clearly visible.

This prophet's name means "who is like unto Jehovah?" "Micah" is an abbreviated form of Micaiah, mentioned in Jeremiah 25:18. He is a native of Moresheth-Gath, prophesied in Judea, and must be distinguished from Micaiah, son of Imlah, in I Kings 22:8.[5]

Little is known about Micah's personal life except that he was born in a fertile valley 17 miles away from the wasteland village of Tekoa, the home of Amos. His birthplace, Moresheth-Gath, is mentioned twice in his book.[6] It is one of the last towns in Hebrew Palestine on the highway leading through the Shephelah to the coastal plain of the Philistines and on toward Egypt. His family is obviously unimportant or his father would be mentioned.

Micah, as a peasant, is a champion for the common people. He revolts at the excesses of the capital city, Jerusalem, and the oppression of the poor people. When unscrupulous men of the cities seek investments in the country, he sees the world populace exposed to their avarice. Micah arises as a spokesman for the oppressed peasants.

The dates of his prophetic ministry have been set variously from 759 to 686 B.C. The three kings mentioned in the inscription of his book are Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, who reign for about 50 years. The most common dates attached to him include the decade from 724 to 715 B.C., although his ministry may extend either before or after this period. The traditional view holds that the period of his prophecy definitely includes a time both before and after the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C. Evading any element of prediction in the book of Micah, some writers now insist upon a period between 711 and 701 B.C., as the time of his public activity.[7] However, the older, established view considers his words against Samaria to be a forecast of impending events rather than a record of things already passed. It will be noted that his references to the fall of Samaria (722 B.C.) are recorded in the future tense. "Naked and wailing, I shall march through the countryside repeating my message," he says.[8] He prophesies the Babylonian captivity even though in his day Assyria is the hostile power. He sees the heart of the country as rotting with such moral decay that the entire nation will fall unless there is a change. He spares nothing that may serve to arouse the people from their inertia.

"The word of the Lord that came to Micah, the Morashite," seems to be his chief qualification. He makes no reference to a definite call as did the prophet Amos. He is a social reformer "who dealt almost exclusively with personal religion and social morality. He was more democratic than Isaiah. His personal relationship was not with kings but with the people. He was a prophet of the people."[9]

Micah appears to be influenced most by Amos. However, he blends the spirit of Hosea and Amos, his prophetic predecessors, and of Isaiah, his contemporary. Both Micah and Isaiah, though addressing their prophecies primarily to Judah, make it clear that God's judgment will also fall on the Northern Kingdom. The aristocratic leanings of Isaiah would seem to leave Micah with a virgin territory for a prophetic ministry among the poorer rural class. As a friend of the oppressed, "his whole soul went out in loyal sympathy to the downtrodden."

The Historical Setting

Micah is surrounded by international pressures, national uneasiness, class strife, social injustice, domestic instability, and religious syncretism. He prophesies perhaps 20 years after Amos, and probably in his early ministry he is coincident with the latter part of Hosea's activity.

The Political Setting

While the initial factors which arouse Micah are mainly political and international, he seems to have little interest in political movements. For example, Isaiah has considerably more to say of a political nature. Assyria threatens the West with her tyranny. Damascus, the capital of Syria, was conquered in 732 B.C., with many of her people carried into Assyrian exile. Israel is about to fall (Samaria captured in 722 B.C.), and Judah is to become the first line of defense against Assyria. The tiny nation becomes the final buffer between Assyria and the realization of her dreams of conquest in Egypt. Regarding these historical facts, it has been said that from the beginning of Assyria's aggressiveness, there had been 13 major campaigns toward Palestine and Egypt.

> There was every indication that these would be accelerated rather than diminished until the imperialistic aspirations of Assyria in the West would be accomplished. It, therefore, seemed evident to Micah that unless she could be very scrupulous with regard to her internal life and foreign relationships, Judah was destined sooner or later for annihilation. Micah knew he was living in a time when it was a question of life or death for his nation. How could anyone who had power of discernment remain silent?[11]

The fall of Samaria, however impressive it was, made no great difference in Judah's political condition. The house of David was still on the throne. The revolt of 720 B.C., to which allusion has already been made, was a part of the general uneasiness in Palestine.

> Sargon, as we know, that year made a campaign in which Philistia was severely punished. Judah seems not to have taken part. Ahaz had, in fact, committed himself too deeply to the Assyrians to think of revolt so soon. The vassalage continued throughout his reign, and into that of his successor.[12]

The situation was hard for the youthful Hezekiah who came to the throne just about that time. Tribute was oppressive, Assyria was far away, and there was a party favorable to Egypt who was looking for a chance to revolt. Everyone remembered the ancient liberties of Judah, and no doubt some of these made the watch words of parties of Zealots.

> Hezekiah, who thus inherited a situation not of his own making, seems not to have been a man of steady purpose, and Isaiah's influence seems not to have been strong with him till toward the close of his life. We are not surprised that the reign was a time of disturbances and reverses. On the whole it is a credit to Hezekiah that he managed to keep his throne and to hand it on to his successor. Only a man of genius could have done more, and Hezekiah certainly was not a man of genius.[13]

The Social Setting

The circumstances of Micah's day are indicated by his social program. There are indications that it is not an isolated case when Ahab arranges for the murder of Naboth because the king wants to enlarge his private gardens.[14]

The common people seem to have neither right nor voice until Micah takes up their cause. He, like Amos, traces social wrongs to the greed of city dwellers.[15] The evils of Judah are traced to Jerusalem; the evils of the northern kingdom are centered in Samaria. The material prosperity which had multiplied the wealth of cities is being curtailed by the pressures of foreign aggression. The insatiable greed of men now finds expression within the local communities as neighbors "bite and devour one another."

Micah opposes the oppression and dispossession of the poor:

> Woe to them that devise iniquity, and work evil upon their beds! When the morning is light, they practice it, because it is in the power of their hand, and they covet fields, and take them by violence; and houses, and take them away: so they oppress a man and his house, even a man and his heritage. Therefore, thus saith the Lord: Behold, against this family do I devise an evil, from which ye shall not remove your necks; neither shall ye go haughtily: for this time is evil.[16]

Micah charges creditors with disregarding justice and fair dealings:

> Even of late my people is risen up as an enemy: ye pull off the robe with the garment from them that pass by securely as men returning from war. The women of my people have ye cast out from their pleasant houses; from their children have ye taken away my glory forever.[17]

He cries out against corrupt administration:

> That they may do evil with both hands earnestly, the prince asketh, and the judge asketh for a reward: and the great man, he uttereth his mischievous desire: so they wrap it up. Who hate the good, and love the evil; who pluck off their skin off them, and their flesh from off their bones; who also eat the flesh of

> my people and flay their skin from off them; and they break their bones, and chop them in pieces, as for the pot, and as flesh within the caldron.[18]

He states that distrust and deceit have resulted in the breakdown of the home:

> Trust ye not in a friend, put ye not confidence in a guide: keep the doors of thy mouth from her that lieth in thy bosom. For the son dishonoureth the father, the daughter riseth up against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; a man's enemies are the men of his own house.[19]

The Religious Setting

The rampant idolatry of an earlier day is charged with precipitating corruption within Judah.

> Morals were appallingly low. Government officials were dishonest; low ethical tone prevailed in most areas of life. Because the nation had lost her moral integrity, she had become sinful, soft, and ripe for conquest. Faced with this situation, Micah was willing to give his life to the task of strengthening the moral fibre of his people as their only sure defense.[20]

The syncretism during recent decades has not resulted in total neglect of religious rites, but those elements which are most exciting to perverted men seem to be practiced most diligently. With the tightening of the Assyrian band around them, the fearful Jews are led in a short-lived reformation by King Hezekiah. The nation's elders consider such revivals of Jehovah-worship so important that they eulogize Hezekiah who has been spurred by Micah's preaching to call for change in religious behavior. They glamourize the fact that in his sweeping reform, Hezekiah destroys the semi-pagan high places and demolishes images, but the unwise international policies of his reign which precipitate tragedy upon the land seem to be forgotten when they write his epitaph: "He trusted in the Lord, the God of Israel; so there was none like him. . . . For he held fast to the Lord; he did not depart from following Him, but kept the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses; And the Lord was with him; wherever he went forth he prospered."[21]

Actually, even though Hezekiah was good and carried out reformation, he seemed relatively powerless to do much in a fundamental way toward raising the low morality, ethical practices, and religious perspectives.[22]

Micah says that religion goes beyond creeds and rites to (1) acts of justice (as in "Amos"), and to (2) the deep love of hesedh (translated mercy, love, or loving kindness) (as in "Hosea"). Micah urges the people to love love for itself and its social expression. This hesedh is frequently used by Hosea to describe kinetic love binding both men and God together, and man to his fellowmen, while leading men to express this deep love in deeds of mercy. This is virile, positive love in action. To walk humbly with God reflects Isaiah's emphasis upon the majesty and holiness of God. Micah, then, synthesizes and vitalizes the three basic social virtues: justice and love toward man with devoted loyalty to God. Man must walk with integrity if he is to escape guilt. Thus, Micah states that Jehovah requires of humanity only what anyone can render if he desires. There are three simple phases of God's call to man. Two of these deal with human relationships: (1) do justly, and (2) love mercy (*hesedh*). The third element of man's responsibility is to walk humbly with God.

The Biblical Exposition

The Text of the Sermons

Since the text of Micah's sermons is much too long to include here, only certain parts will be referred to or quoted under different headings of discussion.

The Content and Organization of the Sermons

The essential contents of Micah's message are divided naturally into three sections which are mutually connected. Each section refers to the other two. What content of ideas is to be found in these? What is their general structure?

The Theme and Purpose of the Sermons.--The three-fold classification of life as advocated by Micah is his theme. This theme is doing righteousness, expressing love, and maintaining fellowship with Jehovah, in contrast to injustice, oppression, and the perfunctory sacrificial service of the priests.

Actually, Micah succeeds where Isaiah failed, but not because of his originality. Indeed, he echoes the principles of Isaiah. But Micah speaks from the point of view of the common people, capitalizing upon their fear of imminent invasion to awaken the conscience of the nation. He reaps where others have sown, perhaps because he reasserts truths already familiar to the people.[23]

The sins which Micah condemns are those that burden the rural, the poor, the small land owners. These are the victims. He cries out against cruelty and inhumanity, rather than against the more common urban practices of sensual immorality. Micah is provincial, concerned primarily with his own little world. It is the miseries of his near neighbors that drain his compassion and arouse his indignation against their oppressors. He sees the Assyrian conquerors marching toward Egypt, so that the sins of Israel are to be punished--not merely those of their heathen neighbors. Micah's purpose, then, in all of his message, is to condemn the sins of his people and awaken the national conscience to man's responsibility to God.

Structure and Outline of the Sermons.--As has been stated, the book of Micah divides naturally into three sections which are interconnected. An outline of them could look as follows:

Superscription 1:1 "The Word of the Lord that came to Micah."

Introduction: Hear; hearken; let the Lord witness against you.

I. Threatenings of Judgment: The wrath to come, and denunciation of corrupt oppressors and prophets. (Chapters 1, 2, and 3)

II. The Mountain of the Lord, and hope of the Coming One: (The restoration of Jerusalem after her judgment, and the announcement of the Messianic salvation.)
(Chapters 4 and 5)

III. The Lord's controversy with Israel: A supreme appeal; a call to repentance. The sin of the city denounced again; the prophet laments the existing corruption.
(Chapters 6 and 7)

Theme

> He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

III. Continued: The remnant's confession of sin in the last days; the prophet's final plea for Israel.

Conclusion: Doxology to God.

Arrangement and Development of Ideas with Emphasis upon Logos.--There are seven chapters in the book of Micah. The three divisions of the book can be mainly distinguished by their content, outlook, and literary form. In the first two chapters Micah speaks of the calamities which will come when Samaria is captured and reduced to a heap of stones by Shalmaneser. The prophet also prophesies against Judah as he declares the troubles that Sennacherib will bring during the reign of Hezekiah. He condemns the sins of Samaria, and he speaks of the coming captivity of the ten tribes. In the third chapter, the prophet denounces the princes of the house of Jacob, the judges, the priests, and the false prophets, as he charges them with greed, injustice, and falsehood. He tells these leaders that because they are at fault, Jerusalem will be reduced to rubbish with the temple mount becoming as a forest. Chapter Four portrays the exaltation of the mountain of the house of the Lord with the nations of the earth resorting unto the God of Jacob. This is followed in quick succession by pictures of peace, of conquest in war, and then of further struggle, including the intervening Babylonian captivity. The sequence is not an orderly one.

In the next chapter in the book--Chapter Five--Micah speaks in particular of the birth of the Christ; he prophesies that the Messiah is to be born at Bethlehem, and that His dominion will extend to the utmost parts of the earth.

> He says that God should raise seven shepherds, who should reign by the sword over Assyria, and in the land of Nimrod; which Calmet explains of Darius, son of Hystaspes; and of the seven Confederates that killed the magician, and who possessed the empire of the Persians, after the extinction of the family of Cyrus. The fifth chapter, from verse 7 to the end, describes the flourishing estate of the Jews in their own country, from the reign of Darius, and after the Maccabbees; yet in such a manner that he mingles several things in it that can apply only to the church of Jesus Christ.[24]

The last two chapters of Micah contain a long invective against the iniquities of Samaria, then a prophecy of the fall of Babylon, and then the reestablishment of the cities of Israel. The greatness of the country possessed by the Israelites is described next, including their happiness and the graces which God will show them. The third section also deals with a call to repentance. This has been called a paraenesis or admonition to repentance and humiliation under the chastening hand of the Lord, in order to participate in the promised salvation.

> As this admonition rests upon the threat of judgment and promise of salvation in the two previous addresses, so does the allusion to judgment contained in the words, "then shall they cry to Jehovah," etc. (ch. 3:4), presuppose the announcement in chapter 1 of the judgment about to burst upon the land, without which it would be perfectly unintelligible. Consequently, there can be no doubt whatever that Micah has simply concentrated the quintessence of his oral discourse into the address contained in this book.[25]

In an argument which is presented in dialogue form, God asks, "What have I not done for you?" The people state their obligation to God as they view it, and question how this may be discharged. God's answer brings the definition of true religion in the summary or key to the book of Micah as found in the following words:

> He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?[26]

The Rhetorical Analysis

While Micah may not demonstrate the "strength of denunciation which rings in Amos, nor the passionate love which tears the heart of Hosea," he is "something of a combination of the character of Amos and Hosea."[27] Harmonized in a quieter expression he was able to give utterance to ideas, even though only in hints and suggestion, which inspired others to work them out and elaborate them into a system.[28]

The Response to the Sermons

On one occasion[29] Micah condemns the audience with such fervor that he appears to be interrupted by his hearers, and the audience disintegrates under his verbal bombardment. In this tense situation the prophet seems to lose control of his listeners only temporarily, however, and he quickly regains command. He then reminds his listeners that his harsh words are not for the upright, but only for those who strip harmless people going about their own business, waylay veterans returning from war, and foreclose on the homes of women, forcing their children out into the cold. This type of behavior will bring destruction.[30]

Apparently Micah is ushered out by the audience and the people welcome a drunken speechmaker who professes to be a prophet. They secure the services of this pervert, with his guarantee of smooth sayings, by promising to keep him supplied with wine and strong drink.[31]

After this pretender is brought in to proclaim peace of mind and universal security, the ousted prophet prepares for what is to be the major part of his message. The prominent men of Judah seem to be gathered in celebration when the prophet appears as an uninvited speaker. Micah seems to address them with such earnestness that the officials in charge are unable to silence him as he begins to attack the four major classes: First, government officials and conniving business interests,[32] and second, the schools of the prophets selfishly concerned with reward.[33] Micah contrasts these religious leaders with his own power and courage when, as a true prophet, he speaks by the spirit of God. Judges and priests are included in his next stanza.[34] Finally, the consequent destruction of the entire nation is threatened.[35]

Some results of Micah's ministry are recorded by the prophet Jeremiah and again in the book of Second Kings. The elders of the land give Micah credit for the sparing of Jerusalem in the crisis when the Assyrian armies seemed destined to conquer all of Judah. They also give him credit for causing King Hezekiah to "fear the Lord and entreat the favor of the Lord."[36] Unfortunately, however, the youthful Hezekiah lacks the support of the influential classes, and his reforms are soon counteracted by vested interests.

In spite of the fact that he is not always well received, then, Micah is one prophet whose influence is clearly indicated in the written records. His success has been written in the annals of Hebrew history; but what is the explanation for the preservation of a record of his influence when similar information regarding the other prophets is conspicuously missing? Probably this fact can be explained by the statement "Micah is one of the few Hebrew prophets who succeeded in making a definite and immediate impression upon the social life of his nation."[37]

> Micah is the democrat, the lowly countryman, and the man of the people. Yet in his passionate loyalty to God, in his pure spirituality, his hatred of sham and pretense, he takes rank with the greatest of the

> prophets. . . . it is due to Micah to say that the requirements of practical godliness have never been more finely summed up, than in the words which even yet are conspicuous as a classical definition of our religion.[38]

Micah's principles have developed into welfare movements, social agencies, and benevolent institutions. The modern labor movement, too, is indebted to him. In subsequent centuries there has been considerable extension of his view that there is good even in the lowest classes of men.

Seven centuries after Micah, when wise men from the East came to Jerusalem asking for Him "Who is born King of the Jews," the answer was given them in the prophet's own words:

> But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.[39]

In view of these facts, the reappraisal of this prophet's relative significance is in order. It has been said that of all prophets, Micah is perhaps the one whose contributions have been most habitually underestimated.

> Rather than being judged by the quality of their poetic utterances, the hitherto prevalent rating of the prophets has been based largely on the number of written pages that has happened to survive from each of them. By this standard, Micah has not fared well. This common depreciation of him is assisted by the situation that, with regard to biographical data, only a few facts can be ascertained regarding him.[40]

These circumstances have conspired to make Micah one of the least appreciated among the prophets. As it becomes realized that the division between so-called "major" and "minor" prophets is based solely on the criterion of volume rather than quality, there is renewed hope for the rating of Micah. He was not a "minor" prophet.[41]

The Appropriateness of the Theme to the Occasion and Audience

As we have noted, Micah's theme is appropriate to the historical occasion of the Assyrian invasion which he feels can be averted only by the repentance of his people and their return to God. The theme is appropriate to the audience, for Jehovah has a case against the "house of Israel," both a past and present controversy, concerning their social and religious sins. Micah's message is not adapted to different gatherings of listeners. It is always the same, one message for all. He is the "Lord's voice" that "crieth unto the city."

The Structure of the Sermons

When the book of Micah is considered as a whole, there are three major units. The opening three chapters deal with judgement; Chapters 4 and 5 speak of comfort; and the final two chapters refer to via salutis or way of salvation. The short introduction declares that the people should hear the Lord's witness against them because of their sins. Jehovah is going to come down to them in judgment. Micah opens his message on a note of opposition. The idea of cause and effect is important to him, as indicated by his use of "therefore" 11 times, "for" 33 times, "but" 11 times, and "because" 6 times. He also uses "in order that" 2 times, "so" 2 times, and "yet" 4 times. While he does not dwell on the darker aspects of Israel's life, he does mention the causes of future judgment. His more elaborate portrayal of future happiness is predicated upon the return of the people to Jehovah. In all of this he maintains the logical relationship by direct statement or by inference. The sequence of ideas is clearly: "You have; therefore I . . .," and "If you . . ., I will . . ." In this topic of cause and effect Micah is, to us, reminiscient of Cicero. He also uses the topic of Distribution of past and present in "The Lord's Controversy" (past and present), with Israel. These logical appeals are not organized by Micah, nor are they found in any formal argument based upon such stated propositions and building to a final conclusion, as we find in the addresses of Saint Paul. Micah simply traces from cause to effect, or joins an effect to other effects, or points from the effects to their antecedents. His address could be called "deliberative" since he proposes a course of action which is possible and necessary and directed toward the welfare of his listeners. However, this course is presented in the simplest of ways, with many interruptions and digressions, not through a closely reasoned systematic treatise. The five Topic Questions of Rhetoric: "What?" "When?" "Where?" "How?" and "Why?" are answered in Micah's message, though not in an orderly fashion.

What?	Judgment by captivity, first in Assyria and then in Babylon. Also The Kingdom of the Messiah.
When?	"Coming" captivities; "in the last days" the Kingdom shall come.
Where?	On Israel and Judah Judgment shall fall. In Mount Zion, in Jerusalem, the Kingdom shall be set up.
How?	The captivities shall come by conquering armies; The Kingdom shall come by the return of the King.
Why?	Judgment will fall because of persistent sin; the Lord has a controversy with Israel and Judah; the Kingdom of the Messiah will come because the Lord hath sworn to perform it.

There are oratorical pleadings in Micah's message, and a superscription which declares that it is the Lord's own words which the prophet speaks. After describing the coming Messianic Kingdom, Micah backs up to prophesy the birth and rejection of the Messiah. Near the end of his message, looking toward the remnant's confession of sin, Micah digresses to remind his listeners that God's blessing will follow judgment. He pleads for the nation once more, identifying himself with Israel--(intercession was a test of the prophetic office)--and he ends with a doxology of praise and a matchless description of Jehovah.

Analysis of Style and Delivery

Micah speaks with simplicity, rigor, and directness. He does not vary his style or word choice to fit various classes of people as he encounters them. He is a spokesman who has been called from among the common people, and the various figures of speech he uses are derived from pastoral and rural life. He is deeply earnest, and he makes extensive use of dialogue. It has been said that:

> He stands next to Isaiah in force and freshness, . . . In the arrangement of his thoughts, however, abrupt and fond of sharp contrasts, he reminds us more of his older contemporary, Hosea.[42]

The characteristics of Micah's style have been described in a limited manner by various scholars. Several quotations from their writings will serve to illustrate individual viewpoints.

> The style of the Book of Micah. . . . is rough, as befitting its peasant author, but it is certainly not uncultivated; rugged perhaps, but pure, clear, and intelligible. It abounds in tropes, figures, paronomasias. It contains sudden transitions of subjects, persons, numbers, genders, which denote in the writer a quick temper and an excitable mind carried away by inward impulse, and restrained by no formal rules of composition.[43]

Another author, comparing Micah to Amos and Hosea, states that he exceeds them in vehemency, and DeWette observes that he has more roundness and clearness in his style and rhythm than Hosea.[44]

Robinson describes Micah's style as one of vividness and emphasis, lightning flashes of indignation, and rapid transitions from threatening to mercy, from vehement emotion to sympathetic tenderness. His rhythm is at times elevated and sublime.[45] Volck also mentions the abruptness of the prophet's style, which, he states, abounds in sudden and quick changes, together with great vigor and an artistic turn of expression.[46] Wolfendale points out that the sudden changes in Micah are frequently hidden by our version, but adds that his diction is clear and that intercourse with northern nations had not debased his excellent Hebrew.[47] Still another author notes that his accent is of nature, plain, blunt, sometimes even rough, and that "apart from a general fondness for assonance and alliteration, the only sign of conscious art in his prophecies is the amazing series of plays on words in the panorama of invasion in Micah 1:10-16."[48] All of these authors note the simplicity, sincerity, and sympathy of his style, and Hastings states that these are also the qualities of his character. Further, as regards his language, "it is measured and rhythmical, the cadences are varied, the grouping is harmonious." (See Pusey's Commentary, pp. 273, 293.)[49] The verbal plays and allusions in the description of the calamities that are to overtake Judah (Chapter 1) are unequalled in vigor and abundance, and must have fallen with peculiar force upon hearers familiar with the places mentioned.[50] In his plays on words and oratorical style Micah reminds us of Cicero. In Chapters 2, 6, and 7 the literary form is that of a dramatic dialogue. Clarke comments that the Lord's Controversy, in Micah 6:1-8, is equal to anything, even in the prophet Isaiah, and that we may justly admire the elegance of Micah's diction--(2:12, 13; 4:1-3); his animation, Chapter 1:5, lines 3 and 4 (quoted in verse form with 4:9); his strength of expression--(1:6; 3:2, 3; 7:1, 2); and his sublimity:--1:2-4; 6:1; 7:16, 17).[51]

Analysis of Micah's style reveals some virtues which Cicero later admired: the general characteristics of correctness, propriety, perspicuity, and ornamentation. The prophet's style also exemplifies versatility.

Wolfendale and Clarke both testify to the correctness or purity of Micah's language, stating that his diction is clear and elegant, and that he speaks in excellent Hebrew.[52] He uses "correct case, tense, gender and number."[53]

If Micah is the democratic champion of the common people, the prophet of the poor, a peasant author, as he has come to be called, then it might be expected that he should demonstrate simplicity or perspicuity above all else. And if he does this, we may also say that his style therefore demonstrates propriety, that the common people might understand his message easily. Four standards for evaluating clarity, or perspicuity, will be applied to his style in an effort to determine the degree of his success in avoiding ambiguity. (1) Thorough knowledge and understanding of the ideas; (2) Discerning vocabulary; (3) Simplicity of grammar and sentence structure; and (4) Direct discourse.

1. Thorough knowledge and understanding of the ideas. There is a simplicity which indicates a full understanding when Micah combines justice, love, and loyalty in his summary of man's responsibility. He describes the political, social, and religious setting, and prescribes a remedial

course of action; he predicts the consequences both of continued injustice and of immediate repentance.

2. Discerning vocabulary. Micah employs a wide variety of words to convey his ideas. For instance, his idea of judgment is made clear by including the following phrases and sentences:

> the Lord cometh forth; he will come down; mountains shall be cleft; make a wailing; mourning as the owls; roll thyself in dust; gone into captivity; against this family do I devise an evil, from which ye shall not remove your necks; utterly spoiled; it shall destroy you; night shall be unto you; it shall be dark unto you; the sun shall go down over the prophets; Zion plowed as a field; smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek; none can deliver; cut off thy horses; pluck up thy groves; shall not reap; trodden down as the mire of the streets; be desolate; lick the dust; move out of holes like worms.

Israel can have no doubt regarding the Lord's threats of punishment. Micah spells out the future of their sin and makes his message clear by using a precise, and varied vocabulary, rich in figures derived from the life of the countryside.

3. Simplicity of grammar. The book of Micah has 119 sentences in the 105 verses, as translated in the King James version. There are three exclamatory sentences and 23 interrogations. Only three sentences continue for more than one verse. One sentence of 94 words comprises four verses;[54] one sentence of 85 words takes three verses;[55] and one sentence of 61 words extends for two verses.[56] All other sentences are contained within a single verse. Only four verses contain 50 or more words; the longest verse

(4:2) has 59 words. There are several sentences with fewer than 20 words in them. The shortest sentence is exclamatory, containing three words, "Woe is me!"

The simple structure of the sentences is further evidenced by the fact that the longest sentence of the book is a series of phrases joined together in lucid fashion by using the connective "and" eight times. In each instance where a long sentence is used, this connective process is repeated. There are no intricate, detailed sentences in the entire book. This is the simple blunt language of the common people.

While each of the three sections in the book of Micah begins with the words "Hear ye," there are secondary transitions also, as indicated in the initial words of the various verses. These also aid clarity. For instance, there are 38 different words or terms used to introduce the 119 individual verses. The words or terms which are found more than once at the beginning of a verse are in the following order of frequency: "and" 18 times; "therefore" 10 times; "for" nine times; "the" eight times; "but" five times; "in that day" four times; "hear" four times' "O" four times; "thou" four times; "who," "now," and "then" three times each; "woe," "arise," "I," "they," and "he" twice each. Throughout the book where the word "and" is employed for a total of 155 times, it often is used to connect a series of phrases, but at other times it serves as a transition to another idea.

There are some instances where transitional material seems to be lacking when a new subject is introduced. However, the obscurity of Micah is not due principally to the lack of transitional materials. In some cases there is no regard for chronology (as in Chapter 5), when Micah talks of things near and far without differentiating; still there are other examples when the element of time is considered. For instance, in Chapter 4, he prefaces his portrayal of universal peace with the words "in the last days it shall come to pass." The use of "now" and "in that day" (5 times) as transitions also serves to create clarity. Micah may not fully understand some aspects of "that day" or the "ruler in Israel," but he delivers God's message faithfully, and carefully follows the effects of greed and oppression to the dark day of judgment. He clarifies the concept of mercy when he shows a nation in darkness coming to the light of God to see the "marvelous things" which await those who turn from their "iniquities" and "their sins."[57]

4. Direct discourse. Direct discourse is used extensively in the book of Micah, and contributes to clearness, also. The thrust of his direct discourse is seen in his use of first- and second-person pronouns. For example, second-person pronouns are extremely vigorous when he says:

> hear ye (3 times); contend thou; ye strong; done to thee; wearied thee; brought thee; redeemed thee; sent before thee; showed thee; require of thee; make thee sick; smiting thee; making thee desolate; thy sins; thou shalt eat; thy casting down; thou shalt show; thou shalt not reap; thou shalt tread; thou shalt not anoint

> thee; make thee; ye bear; thy visitation; trust ye not; thy mouth; thy bosom; thy God; thine heritage.

First-person references include the following expressions:

> my people (3 times); I will make; I will pour down; I will discover; I bring; I devise an evil; I will assemble; I will gather; I will make her destroy thy chariots; I will cut off the cities; I will pluck up thy groves; I will execute vengeance; I wearied; testify against Me; I brought; I sent; I come; bow Myself; I give; I make sick.

Through this medium of clarity, Micah tries to secure a response from those listeners chiefly of the higher, oppressing classes, while still speaking in appropriate words for the common people.

Micah also employs abundant Ornamentation through his use of illustrations and examples, allusions, similes, metaphors, imagery, and personification, as well as through antithesis, progression, repetition, analogy, rhetorical questions, suspense, and climax. His similes, metaphors, and imagery constitute his major use of examples and illustrations. It might be said that each of these figures or images is used as an example or illustration to clarify the speaker's ideas. No figures are extended or developed fully. Allusions and pictorial words constitute short units, but no individual illustration or image is expected to stand in isolation.

One of Micah's examples may suggest the use of an imaginary or hypothetical case, or, he may desire to soften somewhat the direct accusation of an actual occurrence when he says, "If a man walking in the spirit of falsehood do lie, saying, I will prophesy unto thee of wine and of strong drink, he shall even be the prophet of this people."[58]

The prophet illustrates peace and contentment with these words:

> And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: . . . they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid; for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it.[59]

Micah cites the examples of the exodus, Balaam consulting Balak, Omri's statutes, and Ahab's works, to give a clear picture of ideas. His illustrations include men returning from war, widows, children, a man and his house, the inhabitant of Maroth, the inhabitant of Zaanan the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, a man's enemies, the flock of thine heritage, which dwell solitarily in the wood, feeding in Bashan and Gilead, "as in the days of old."

Allusions are frequently used by Micah. He refers to Joshua's division of the land,[60] David's lament over Saul and Jonathan,[61] and his predecessor's challenge.[62] He also speaks in the words of Psalms,[63] Proverbs,[64] and Amos.[65] His historical references include Jothan, Ahaz, Hezekiah, the inhabitant of Zaanan, who came not forth, the mourning of Bethezel; and again, the Exodus: "I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt; redeemed thee out of the house of servants; I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam."

Illustrations are selected primarily for their power, while allusions lend their support.

Similes used by Micah total 29, and are as follows:

as wax before the fire;
as the waters that are poured down a steep place;
as an heap of the field;
as plantings of a vineyard;
wailing like the dragons;
mourning like the owls;
baldness as the eagle;
risen up as an enemy;
as men averse from war;
as the sheep of Bozrah;
as the flock in the midst of their fold;
as for the pot;
as flesh within the caldron;
plowed as a field;
as the high places of the forest;
as a woman in travail;
like a woman in travail;
as the sheaves;
as a dew from the Lord;
as the showers upon the grass;
as a young lion among the flocks of sheep;
as a lion among the beasts of the forest;
as when they have gathered the summer fruits;
as the grapegleanings of the vintage;
as a brier;
as the mire of the streets;
as in the days of thy coming out of the land of Egypt;
lick the dust like a serpant;
move out of their holes like worms of the earth.

The four purposes of the simile as given in the *Ad Herennium* were embellishment, proof, clarity, or vividness.[66]

Metaphors are listed among those figures and terms given in the following section on imagery.

Imagery, or other pictorial language besides the classified figures of speech, makes Micah's utterances more graphic, and may be classified as visual (60 times), auditory (28 times), gustatory (14 times), olfactory (1 time), tactual (24 times), kinaesthetic (81 times), and organic or internal (70 times).

Included among the visual images are:

high places (2); mountains; valleys cleft; graven images; stripped naked; gate; presents; morning light; go haughtily; pleasant houses, as the sheep of Bozrah; flock in the midst of their fold; hide his face; cover their lip; high places of the forest; whole earth; tower of the flock; stronghold of the daughter of Zion; horses; thousands of rams; rivers of oil; treasures of wickedness; scant measure; wicked balances; bag of deceitful weights; hunt with a net; a watchman; a guide; shame shall cover; the sea.

Auditory images include:

hearken; wail; howl; declare; weep; lie; a parable; a doleful lamentation; great noise; cry Peace; no answer of God; law shall go forth from Zion; the word of the Lord from Jerusalem; rebuke strong nations; ears shall be deaf; mouth of the Lord of hosts; soothsayers; let the hills hear; hear ye; the rod; doors of thy mouth; plead; decree; sworn.

Gustatory images are:

wine; strong drink; eat the flesh; pot; flesh in caldron; mouths; feed; eat; not satisfied; drink wine; cluster to eat; first ripe fruit; feed in bashan; lick the dust.

The 1 olfactory image is "burnt offerings."

The 24 tactual images include these:

burned with fire; broken up; pluck off skin; flesh from off their bones; flay their skin; break their bones; chop them in pieces; bite with their teeth; pangs have taken thee; beat in pieces; sick in smiting; a brier; sharper than a thorn hedge; lieth in thy bosom.

Of the 81 kinaesthetic images, these seem most interesting:

tread; pour down stones; roll thyself in the dust; bind the chariot to the swift beast; beds; take by violence;

remove; cast a cord by lot; walketh uprightly; risen up; pull off the robe; cast out; build up Zion; lean upon the Lord; flow into it; walk in his paths; beat swords into plowshares; lift up a sword; sit under his vine; arise and thresh; gather them as sheaves; gather in troops; smite the judge; hand lifted up; cut off; destroy thy chariots; thrown down strongholds; pluck up thy groves; destroy cities; sow; reap; tread olives; anoint with oil; gather summer fruit; lie in wait for blood; do evil with both hands earnestly; wrap it up; feed; lay their hand upon their mouth; cast all their sins into the depths of the sea.

Of the 70 organic images, these are a few.

Jacob; wound is incurable; delicate children; fields; an enemy; polluted; heads; blood; money; Zion plowed as a field; mountain; a strong nation; woman in travail; strength of the Lord; strong foundation of the earth; fruit of my body; flock of thine heritage; like a serpent; Abraham; our fathers.

The cumulative force of these images is impressive. They transcend mere suggestiveness and produce a persuasive style by implying much more than the individual words actually state.

Personification is employed by Micah 8 times:

hearken; O earth; she gathered it as the hire of an harlot; declare unto Jacob his transgression, and to Israel his sin; the daughter of Jerusalem; daughter of troops; daughter of Zion; hear ye; O mountains.

Ornamentation is further seen in the use of Antitheses:

For the inhabitant of Maroth waited carefully
for good: but evil came down from the Lord;

Then shall the seers be ashamed . . . but I am
full of power; Thou shalt eat, but not be
satisfied;

And thou shalt take hold, but shalt not deliver;
and that which thou deliverest will I give up to
the sword.

Thou shalt sow, but thou shalt not reap;
Thou shalt tread the olives, but thou shalt

> not anoint thee with oil, and sweet wine,
> but shalt not drink wine.[67]

Progression is another form of Ornamentation the prophet uses:

> For the transgression of Jacob is all this . . .
> the sins of the house of Israel.
> What is the transgression of Jacob?
> Is it not Samaria?
> And what are the high places of Judah?
> Are they not Jerusalem?
> Therefore I will make Samaria as an heap of
> the field, and as plantings of a vineyard.
> The heads thereof judge for reward,
> and the priests hereof teach for hire,
> and the prophets thereof divine for money;
> yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say,
> Is not the Lord among us?
> Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed
> as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps . . .

Repetition is still another form of Ornamentation which Micah uses well:

> Therefore I will wail and howl, I will go
> stripped and naked: I will make a wailing
> like the dragons, and mourning as the owls.
>
> Therefore night shall be unto you, that ye
> shall not have a vision; and it shall be dark
> unto you, that ye shall not divine; and the
> sun shall go down over the prophets,
> and the day shall be dark over them.
>
> And the remnant of Jacob shall be . . .
> as a dew from the Lord,
> as the showers upon the grass.[68]

Analogy as seen in the imagery of Micah serves the threefold purpose of contributing clearness, energy, and ornamentation. Some examples of analogy which especially give force are the following:

> Sailing like the dragons; mourning as the owls;
> wound is incurable; as an heap of the field; eat
> the flesh of my people; bite with their teeth;

> my soul desired the first ripe fruit; hunt his brother with a net; the Lord shall be light unto me; chop them in pieces; lick the dust like a serpent; move out of their holes like worms.

Micah's stylistic energy is further implemented by the techniques of suspense and climax. Suspense is created as he threatens judgment; he seems to see no hope; then suddenly he pictures the coming of the day with peace and plenty.[69] Climax appears to be neglected by Micah because he reaches the zenith of materialistic existence in the middle of his book, with his portrayal of tranquility;[70] however, Micah considers the less materialistic concepts of the final verses to be his climax. Here he promises a spiritual peace.[71]

Rhetorical questions are varied in the book of Micah. The first 14 questions are single lines, while 8 of the last 9 are multiple lines with the structure of parallelisms. These interrogations arouse interest, sustain attention, enhance listening ease, create beauty and variety, emphasize directness, and help to keep the book in focus.

> What is the transgression of Jacob?
> Is it not Samaria?
> And what are the high places of Judah?
> Are they not Jerusalem?
> Is the spirit of the Lord straitened?
> Are these his doings?
> Do not my words do good to him that walketh uprightly?
> Is it not for you to know judgment?
> Is not the Lord among us?
> Now why dost thou cry aloud?
> Is there no king in thee?
> Is thy counsellor perished?
> O my people, what have I done unto thee?
> and wherein have I wearied thee?
> Wherewith shall I come before the Lord,

and bow myself before the high God?
Shall I come before Him with burnt offerings,
with calves of a year old?
Will the Lord be pleased with a thousand rams,
or with ten thousands of rivers of oil?
Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression,
the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?
And what doth the Lord require of thee,
but to do justly, and to love mercy,
and to walk humbly with thy God?
Are there yet the treasures of wickedness
in the house of the wicked,
and the scant measure that is abominable?
Shall I count them pure with the wicked balances,
and with the bag of deceitful weights?
Where is the Lord thy God?
Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity,
and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of
his heritage?

Unclassified figures in the book include puns and verbal plays. In Chapter One, Micah indulges in a striking series of puns, some of which Moffatt endeavors to bring out in his translation:

Weep tears at Teartown (Bochim)
grovel in the dust at Dusttown (Beth-ophrah)
fare forth, stripped, O Fairtown (Saphir)
. . . Israel's kings are ever balked at Balktown
(Achzib)
. . . Israel, shave your head and hair in mourning
for your children dear
Shave it like a vulture's bare,
for they are lost to you.[72]

The verbal plays and allusions in the description of the calamities that are to overtake Judah (Chapter 1) are said to be unequalled in vigor and abundance.[73]

The versatility of Micah is evident in the listing of those to whom his message is addressed, or against whom the prophet brings charges. The following terms indicate his extensive variety:

> Samaria; Jerusalem; all ye people; O earth; Jacob; House of Israel; Judah; house of Aphrah; inhabitant of Saphir; inhabitant of Zaanan; Bethezel; Mareth; Lachish; daughter of Zion; Meresheth-gath; houses of Achzib; Kings of Israel; Abdullam; congregation of the Lord; O heads of Jacob; remnant of Israel; princes of the house of Israel; prophets; priests; seers; diviners; Zion; daughter of troops; his people; O man; rich man; Omri; house of Ahab; prince; judge; great man.

It is interesting to note that for all of these addressed, the message remains the same.

Micah uses 15 different terms in the 46 times that he refers to deity by name. "Lord" is used 30 times; "Spirit of the Lord" and "Lord our God?" are found twice each. The other 12 terms are used only once. It should be indicated, however, that there is an intensity of similar patterns (e.g., verbs) among these variations. In the midst of diversity there is much repetition.[74]

Micah does not rage, but variety sharpens the impact of his energy as he hurls his invectives, and the names of places ornament his eloquence like lights, even as they do in the speech of Amos. There seems to be no element of pretense in his vigorous words. They are simply those of an aroused prophet, whose delivery shows both his indignation and concern. For example, he clarifies and emphasizes his charges against the nation by referring to her sin in 78 varied, powerful terms.[75] A few are:

> the women of my people have ye cast out, from their children have ye taken away my glory for ever; a lying man who walks in the spirit of falsehood is the prophet of this people; ye hate the good; love the evil; pluck off skin; prepare war against God; abhor judgment; pervert all equity; the good man is perished out of the

> earth; the best of them is as a brier.

Verbs always indicate energy. Micah uses 344 of them in the 105 verses, for an average of 3.27 verbs in each verse. The verbs which contribute most to the forceful delivery of Micah are as follows:

> hearken; tread upon; be molten; be cleft; poured down; beaten to pieces; burned; lay desolate; gathered; go stripped; bind; be a lie; make bald; err; bite; confounded; abhor judgment; learn war; driven out; afflicted; perished; defiled; contend; smiting; hissing; uttereth; subdue.

Most of Micah's delivery is in the moderate style. The moderate style is between the plain and the grand style, and contains rhythmic ornamentation along with figures of speech. Sense the rhythm in these words:

> They covet fields and seize them;
> and houses, and take them away:
> and they oppress a man and his house,
> even a man and his heritage.[76]

Micah is too vehement to speak in a plain or subdued manner. As St. Augustine states, the subdued manner is useful for teaching something, but a moderate manner is more appropriate when one "condemns or praises something." And when something is to be done, and the speaker addresses those who ought to do it but do not wish to do it, then those things "should be spoken in the grand manner in a way appropriate to the persuasion of their minds."[77] Micah is certainly seeking to move adverse minds, and cannot speak in less than the moderate mode. However, progression is the goal of his forceful words, and energetic sentences. His accusations of guilt and threats of judgment are only the beginning of his message. He constantly moves onward and upward, proceeding from the physical elements of life to the acme of spiritual unity with God. This is the "truth" to be performed "to Jacob, and the mercy to Abraham, which thou has sworn unto our fathers from the days of old."[78] Micah uses the element of climax as well as progressive movement; it might be thought that his real climax is in the fourth chapter when he depicts the peaks of Israel's prosperity:

> But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid; for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it.[79]

However, as has been noted, the prophet appears to consider the less materialistic concepts of his final words to be his true climax. Here he promises a spiritual peace which is based upon freedom from sin and the absence of guilt.

> Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity,
> and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of
> his heritage?
> he retaineth not his anger forever, because he
> delighteth in mercy.
> he will turn again, he will have compassion upon us;
> He will subdue our iniquities;
> and Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of
> the sea.
> Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and mercy to
> Abraham,
> which thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days
> of old.[80]

Thus he concludes in the grand style, showing versatility in his mode of delivery, the lyrical quality of his peroration being as beautiful as his theological insight is profound.

Analysis of Pathos and Ethos

Are there evidences of pathos and ethos in Micah's book? Yes, but those of pathos predominate.

In Micah's address, various emotional appeals can be found, in this order of frequency: guilt (32 verses), security (28 verses), satisfaction (20 verses), success (11 verses), suffering (7 verses), failure (4 verses), indignation (4 verses), and integrity (1 verse). Some verses involve more than one emotion, but have one tone or force which is dominant.

The appeal to conscience and to feelings of guilt is predominant in Micah. Nearly all of the sixth chapter is devoted to arousing these feelings. Other sections also speak to the conscience of Israel in the attempt to help her see her own shame. He says:

> Let the Lord God be witness against you . . . for the transgression of Jacob is all this, and for the sins of the house of Israel. What is the transgression of Jacob? Is it not Samaria? And what are the high places of Judah? Are they not Jerusalem? . . . Woe to them that devise iniquity, and work evil upon their beds! And they covet fields and take them by violence; . . . so they oppress a man and his house; . . . is the spirit of the Lord straitened? are these His doings? Ye pull off the robe with the garment . . . the women of my people have ye cast out . . . who hate the good and love the evil; who also eat the flesh of my people . . . Then shall they cry unto the Lord, but He will not hear them: He will even hide His face from them at that time, as they have behaved themselves ill in their doings . . . to declare unto Jacob his transgression and to Israel his sin . . . the Lord hath a controversy with His people . . . O My people, what have I done unto thee? and wherein have I wearied thee? testify against Me. For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed thee out of the house of servants; and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam. . . . and the prophets divine for money; and their tongue is deceitful in their mouth. For . . . the good man is perished out of the earth; and there is none upright among men.[81]

The desire for security is the second emotion to which Micah appeals most, just as Hosea does, though it is the main appeal in Amos. At least one verse in each chapter of Micah seems to aim at arousing this desire as motivation for action. Warnings given of the sudden lack of security are:

> I will make Samaria as an heap of the field, and I will discover the foundations thereof. Evil came down from the Lord unto the gate of Jerusalem. In that day shall one take up a parable against you, and lament with a doleful lamentation, and say, We be utterly spoiled; He hath changed the portion of my people; Arise ye, and depart; for this is not your rest; because it is polluted, it shall destroy you, even with sore destruction. . . .

A positive appeal to the desire for security is found in these words:

> I will surely assemble, O Jacob, all of thee; I will surely gather the remnant of Israel; I will put them together as the sheep of Bozrah, as the flock in the midst of their fold; they shall make great noise by reason of the multitude of men. . . . and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them.[82]

The emotional desire for satisfaction is appealed to more by Micah than by Hosea (18 verses) or by Amos (4 verses). Micah's 20 verses include the desire for worldwide prestige, peace, domestic welfare, plenty, dominion, permanence, salvation, light, victory over enemies, and forgiveness. Some aspects of this desire are appealed to on a temporal level, but the concluding part of the book, as we have seen, especially deals with satisfactions involving the inner or spiritual life, when God "that pardoneth iniquity" and "delighteth in mercy," "will turn again," to "have compassion upon us," and "will subdue our iniquities."[83]

Other segments of the book are directed toward desires somewhat more common, and less subjective, as illustrated below:

> And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; . . . for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, . . . and they shall beat their swords into plowshares . . . they shall sit every man under his vine . . . and none shall make them afraid; . . . But Thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be Ruler in Israel; Whose goings have been from of old, from everlasting. . . . and He shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord His God; . . . When I fall, I shall arise; . . . I will bear the indignation of the Lord, until He plead my cause . . . He will bring me forth to thelight, and I shall behold His righteousness. Then she that is Mine enemy shall see it, and shame shall cover her which said unto me, Where is the Lord thy God? The nations shall see and be confounded . . . They shall lay their hand upon their mouth, they shall be afraid of the Lord our God.[84]

Power, health, respect, and conquest are all elements of the success to which the prophet calls his people. He says:

> The Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth, even forever. . . . the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem. . . . there the Lord shall redeem thee from the hand of thine enemies. . . . but they know not the thoughts of the Lord, neither understand they His counsel: for He shall gather them as the sheaves into the floor: Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion. . . . I will make thy hoofs brass: and thou shalt beat in pieces many people: and I will consecrate their gain unto the Lord, and their substance unto the Lord of the whole earth. And the remnant of Jacob shall be in the midst of many people as a dew from the Lord . . . and the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep.[85]

Fear of suffering is not a major threat in the preaching of Micah, since we find it in only seven verses. Rather, he places strong emphasis upon the happy consequences of upright living. Hosea (32 verses) and Amos (25 verses) both use the emotion of human fear much more. However, Micah does not entirely omit the thought of suffering:

> He shall . . . make thee bald, and poll thee for thy delicate children; . . . for they are gone into captivity from thee. Be in pain, and labour to bring forth, O daughter of Zion, like a woman in travail: for now shalt thou go forth out of the city, and thou shalt go even to Babylon: Therefore also will I make thee sick in smiting thee, in making thee desolate because of thy sins . . . We be utterly spoiled.[86]

Both spiritual and physical failure are portrayed:

> Therefore night shall be unto you, that ye shall not have a vision; . . . Then shall the seers be ashamed; . . . yea, they shall all cover their lips; for there is no answer of God. . . . Thou shalt sow, but thou shalt not reap; thou shalt tread the olives, but thou shalt not anoint thee with oil; and sweet wine, but shalt not drink wine.[87]

The prophet's indignation is directed in strong emotion against all groups of men, and their prevailing injustices:

> Thus saith the Lord concerning the prophets that make my people err, that . . . cry, peace; and He that putteth not into their mouths, they even prepare war against Him . . . there is none upright among men: they all lie in wait for blood; they hunt every man his brother with a net, That they may do evil with both hands earnestly.[88]

Integrity among the people is the goal of the true prophets. Each prophet attempts by various means to lead the nation to act with this sense of uprightness. Integrity is based upon faith in the right, and appeals to it are less subjective in nature than the more negative appeal to shame or guilt. Micah's message is more positive than that of Amos or Hosea; thus, he mingles faith with fear in each section of his book.

It is not difficult to see that Micah's message, regardless of the prophet's own ethos, inevitably would involve him in controversy. He seems to have come in contact with what was a growing opposition against the new prophecy, namely, the organized bodies of seers which resented both the message and the office of the new type of prophet.[89] Conflict on any level has a certain element of fascination. The prophets capitalize upon this universal interest when they voice their protest, stand in opposition, and come into open conflict. The prophet apparently cannot merely advocate a course of action; he cannot be positive only; he must have a controversy; he must create conflict by opposing that which is contrary to his message. Therefore, Micah is definitely unpopular with a large majority of his audience, especially at the beginning of his ministry, before any reforms take place. He does not begin his message with any kind of "audience adaptation" whatsoever. Part of the "audience adaptation" which is so evident in the speeches of Saint Paul is that his controversy with his listeners is, especially at the beginning of a speech, sublimated or even covered by positive support of that with which he can sympathize. The prophets of the Old Testament take no time for this kind of conciliation. When they begin the message related to their own people, they begin on a note of open opposition.

Nevertheless, Micah is so identified with his audience, on one hand, and with God on the other, that there is no room for the use of "I." He has a remarkable power to detach himself from personal and national prejudice. His native instincts do not dull his moral sensitivity; his deep love for the nation does not deter his uncompromising message against national sins. In his speeches, love and judgment struggle for expression. He demonstrates a moral indignation that stamps through his book. His is the voice of social righteousness, the voice of the populace calling for democratic action. When he speaks in the first person as the spokesman for Jehovah, he is the voice of the God of hosts. As His voice, the prophet reiterates God's right to rule Israel; their indebtedness to Him, their failure without Him, and their assured triumph with His blessing. Both Micah's thoughts and his language justify his claim to speak in the power and inspiration of Jehovah.[90] In the last five verses of the book, there are no first-person singular pronouns, but there are five second-person pronouns, all of which refer to God, and seven third-person singular pronouns, all of which refer to God. Of the ten third-person plural pronouns, eight refer to "our enemies" and the enemies of God. The virtuous character of the prophet is evidenced by his strict moral code, implicit trust in God's non-material rewards for righteous living, and support of the cause of justice without regard to personal cost.

Furthermore, the intelligence or competence of Micah is demonstrated by his tracing of injustice to its inexorable conclusions in the world. He foresees the role of Assyria and Babylon, and symptoms and trends which indicate the future. At the same time he reveals goodwill as he foretells the results of righteousness and calls for a return to the ways of Jehovah.

Summary

Micah is a speaker of whom we know very little except that he is a commoner from the village of Moresheth-gath, between Jerusalem and the border of Egypt. His training, too, largely is unknown. He omits all reference to a specific call; he makes no mention of his family life. "The word of the Lord" seems to be his single qualification. He is simple, direct, and provincial. The impact of his message is felt in his own generation, in the days of Jeremiah, at the time of Christ, and in later centuries.

In his day there is international tyranny, national unrest, social injustice, economic insecurity, domestic infidelity, religious indifference, and moral weakness. He attacks all of these as the "voice of the Lord" with the "word of the Lord."

The book of Micah, divided into three interrelated sections, is not one of systematic, closely reasoned argument.

Logical appeals are not organized by Micah, nor are they found in any formal argument based upon stated propositions, as we find in the addresses of Saint Paul. Micah simply traces from cause to effect. His message could be called "deliberative" in the classical sense, though he knew nothing of that classification in his day. His transitions of subjects, persons, numbers, and genders are sudden and abrupt. He apparently follows no formal rules of composition, and is not restrained by them, but expresses one moment the threatenings of the Lord, and the next His mercy and tenderness.

Micah's theme is appropriate to the occasion and audience. However, he does not reveal any effort at audience adaptation. He proclaims the same message in the same manner and style for all. Though his message is chiefly to the ruling classes, he speaks in a language familiar to the common people, so they understand him; and he uses figures of speech derived from rural life. He speaks in the first person as the spokesman of Jehovah, and is the "Lord's voice" that "crieth in the city." He begins his speech on a note of open opposition and controversy. His introduction is direct. No remarks are used to make his listeners attentive and well-disposed toward him, other than his credentials: "the word of the Lord." The particular motives, emotion, or prejudices of any one group of listeners are irrelevant to the introduction and message, for he does not feel that the minds of the audience need to be first conciliated. The "chips fall where they may."

Micah's style is appropriate, direct, clear, and rigorous, even rough, perhaps, but not uncultivated. It is versatile and abounding with ornamentation. The prophet uses illustrations, examples, allusions, historical references, similes, metaphors, imagery, and personification, as well as antithesis, progression, repetition, analogy, suspense, climax, and rhetorical questions and rhythm. His forceful delivery is created by utilizing varied word selection, sentence structure including interrogations, and sudden transitions, and by progression from a moderate to grand style. He moves from words of moderate vehemence to lightning flashes of indignation, and to language both elevated and sublime. His words amply express without obtuseness, exciting the memory and imagination of his audience, as Saint Paul does. He presents the character of Jehovah, and his delivery comes from the heart.

While the appeals of Micah include the logic of cause and effect, the strongest and most characteristic motivation he employs is the pathetic. He is not so strongly negative as are Amos and Hosea. His appeals based upon fear outnumber his positive ones which are founded upon faith, to the extent of 75 to 32. His two most common appeals are negative--(guilt, 32 times; and insecurity, 28)--but his third and fourth most frequent ones are positive--(satisfaction, 20 times; and success, 11 times). His threats of suffering are modified, while his promises of satisfaction are extended, but nevertheless his pathos are predominately negative. Feeling indignation and love himself, he tries to arouse the people to guilt, fear, and the feelings of indignation toward self, and the emotion of love that goes with repentance, applying his facts so as to persuade them.

Micah is the object of the opposition's conflict and resentment. He does not consider the overtones, needs, and characteristics of his audience as far as adapting his message to their feelings is concerned. However, wisdom and virtue are implied in his character as well as his message. There is no room for the use of "I," or presentation of personal character, except in his claim to the power and inspiration of Jehovah. Micah is completely identified with his audience and their sins on the one hand, as an intercessor, and with God as Judge and Lover on the other. Chiefly he is "the Voice" of the "God of Hosts."

Micah is of greater consequence as a prophet than the brevity of his book would indicate. Evidence reveals that his speaking accomplished the persuasive purposes which he held at the beginning of his ministry.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Wm. E. Orchard, Oracles of God (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1922), p. 64.

[2] Orchard, p. 64.

[3] Raymond Calkins, The Modern Message of the Minor Prophets (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947), p. 56.

[4] Calkins, p. 56.

[5] James Wolfendale, Homiletical Commentary on the Minor Prophets (London: Richard Dickenson, 1897), p. 395.

[6] Micah 1:1, 14.

[7] R. E. Wolfe, "Micah Introduction," The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), VI, p. 898.

[8] Micah 1:8.

[9] George L. Robinson, The Twelve Minor Prophets (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1926), p. 26.

[10] Robinson, pp. 94, 95.

[11] Wolfe, The Interpreter's Bible, VI, p. 898.

[12] Henry F. Smith, Old Testament History, International Theological Library (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1909), p. 238.

[13] Henry F. Smith, p. 238.

[14] I Kings 21.

[15] Micah 1:15.

[16] Micah 2:1-3.

[17] Micah 2:8, 9.

[18] Micah 7:3; 3:2, 3.

[19] Micah 7:5, 6.

[20] Wolfe, The Interpreter's Bible, VI, pp. 898, 899.

[21] II Kings 18:5-7.

[22] Wolfe, VI, p. 899.

[23] Charles F. Kent, The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1932), pp. 75, 76.

[24] Adam Clarke, The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments: The Text Carefully Printed from the Most Correct Copies of the Present Authorized Translation, Including the Original Readings and Parallel Texts with a Commentary and Critical Notes Designed as a Help to a Better Understanding of the Sacred Writings. A New Edition with the Author's Final Corrections (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n.d.), p. 708.

[25] Wolfendale, Homiletical Commentary on the Minor Prophets, p. 396.

[26] Micah 6:8.

[27] Orchard, Oracles of God, p. 85.

[28] Orchard, p. 86.

[29] Micah 2:1-3.

[30] Micah 2:7-10.

[31] Micah 2:11.

[32] Micah 3:1-4.

[33] Micah 3:5-7.

[34] Micah 3:9-11.

[35] Micah 3:12.

[36] Jeremiah 26:17-19.

[37] Kent, The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus, p. 74.

[38] Henry J. Pickett, The Hebrew Prophet and the Modern Preacher (London: Holborn Publishing House, 1922), pp. 65, 66.

[39] Micah 5:2.

[40] Wolfe, The Interpreter's Bible, VI, p. 897.

[41] Wolfe, VI, p. 900.

[42] Wolfendale quoting Lange, Homiletical Commentary on the Minor Prophets, p. 396.

[43] W. J. Deane, "Introduction to the Book of Micah," The Pulpit Commentary (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., n.d.), pp. vi-vii.

[44] "Micah, Book of," The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural Dictionary, ed. Samuel Fallows (Chicago: Howard Severance Co., 1917), II, p. 1158.

[45] Robinson, The Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 104.

[46] Wilhelm Volck, quoted by J. F. McCurdy, "Micah," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1910), VII, p. 362.

[47] Wolfendale, Homiletical Commentary on the Minor Prophets, p. 396.

[48] "Micah," The Speaker's Bible, ed. Edward Hastings (Founded by James Hastings) (Aberdeen, Scotland: Speaker's Bible Offices, n.d.), p. 107.

[49] W. J. Deane, "Introduction to the Book of Micah," The Pulpit Commentary, p. vii.

[50] Deane, p. vii.

[51] Adam Clarke, Commentary and Critical Notes, IV, pp. 709, 710.

[52] Wolfendale, Homiletical Commentary on the Minor Prophets, p. 396; Cf. Clarke, pp. 709, 710.

[53] Cicero De Oratore, Trans. E. W. Sutton, Loeb Classical Library, ed. James Loeb (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), III. 37.

[54] Micah 5:1-13.

[55] Micah 3:1-3.

[56] Micah 4:6, 7.

[57] Micah 7:19.

[58] Micah 2:11.

[59] Micah 4:3, 4.

[60] Micah 2:4; 6:5.

[61] Micah 1:10.

[62] Micah 1:2; I Kings 20:28.

[63] Psalms 2:1; 3:2; 7:2, 7.

[64] Proverbs 6:9-11.

[65] Amos 2:3, 6, 11; 3:6.

[66] Rhetorica Ad Herennium, trans. Harry Caplan, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), IV, p. 61; Quintilian Institutio Oratoria, trans. H. E. Butler, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), VII. 3. 72.

[67] Micah 1:12.

[68] Micah 1:8; 3:6; 5:7.

[69] Micah 4:1-7.

[70] Micah 4:1-4.

[71] Micah 7:18-20.

[72] Cited in Robinson, The Twelve Minor Prophets, pp. 104, 105.

[73] W. J. Deane, "Introduction to the Book of Micah," The Pulpit Commentary, p. vii.

[74] Supra, p. 171.

[75] The 78 varied, strong terms: transgressions of Jacob; sins of the house of Israel; high places of Judah; graven images; hire of an harlot; wound is uncurable; transgressions of Israel; sin; a lie; iniquity, work evil; covet fields; take them by violence; covet houses, take them away; oppress a man and his house; time is evil; my people is risen up as an enemy; ye pull off the robe with the garment from them that pass by; the women of my people have ye cast out, from their children have ye taken away my glory forever; it is polluted; a lying man who walks in the spirit

of falsehood is the prophet of this people; hate the good; love the evil; pluck off skin; pluck off them; they break their bones; chop them in pieces; behaved themselves ill in their doings; make my people err; bite with their teeth; cry Peace; prepare war against God; abhor judgment; pervert all equity; Jacob's transgression; Israel's sin; build up Zion with blood; build Jerusalem with iniquity; judge for reward; teach for hire; divine for money; treasures of wickedness in the house of the wicked; scant measure that is abominable; wicked balances; deceitful weights; rich men are full of violence; spoken lies; tongue is deceitful; thy sins; statutes of Omri; works of house of Ahab; walk in their counsels; the good man is perished out of the earth; none upright among men; all lie in wait for blood; they hunt every man his brother with a net; do evil with both hands earnestly; prince asketh for a reward; judge asketh for a reward; the great man uttereth his mischievous desire; they wrap it up; the best of them is as a brier; the most upright is sharper than a thorn hedge; the son dishonoureth the father, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; a man's enemies are the men of his own house; the fruit of their doings; iniquity; transgression of the remnant of his heritage; our iniquities; all their sins.

[76] Micah 2:2.

[77] Saint Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1958), IV. 19. 145.

[78] Micah 7:20.

[79] Micah 4:1-4.

[80] Micah 7:18-20.

[81] Micah 1:1-3, 5, 13; 2:1, 2, 7-9; 3:1-4, 8-11; 6:1-12; 6:16; 7:2.

[82] Micah 1:4-9, 12, 14, 15; 2:4-6, 10-13; 3:12; 4:11; 5:1, 10-15; 7:4-6, 13.

[83] Micah 7:18-20.

[84] Micah 4:1-5; 5:2-4; 7:7-12, 15-17.

[85] Micah 4:6-8, 10, 12, 13; 5:5-9.

[86] Micah 1:11, 16; 2:3, 4; 4:9, 10; 6:13.

[87] Micah 3:6, 7; 6:14, 15.

[88] Micah 7:2-4.

[89] Orchard, Oracles of God, p. 108.

[90] Robinson, The Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 104.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARIES, COMPARISON, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study was an investigation of the sources of the rhetoric of the Apostle Paul, in an effort to determine the place of classical rhetoric in transforming a local Hebrew sect into an expansive international faith. Chapter I asks, "What influence, if any, did the precepts of classical rhetoric have upon Paul's speeches? What was Paul's attitude toward 'eloquent wisdom' and 'lofty words' at a time when the art of speech was highly favored? Did the Apostle speak solely from Hebrew prophetic tradition, inspiration, and natural genius? Or does he add to his knowledge of Scripture and synagogue training the new element of classical rhetoric, demonstrating knowledge of its canons?"

By utilizing the classical rationale of rhetoric, a valid norm was provided against which to compare and contrast the preaching of Paul and the prophets. The definiteness of the rationale was made possible by attention to the details of canons and precepts within the classical rhetorical system and within the rhetoric of Paul and the prophets. By virtue of this method it was possible to gather data and report it systematically and sympathetically.

Chapter II gives historical and biographical background for Paul's addresses, and includes the canons and precepts of classical rhetoric as Cicero and Quintilian presented them. In Chapters III to VIII, for purposes of contrast, rhetorical analyses were made of three of Paul's speeches, and of the discourses of Amos, Hosea, and Micah who were steeped in the eloquence of the Law, as was Paul. A retrospective view of these chapters will logically lead to setting forth comparisons between the speeches of the Apostle and those of the prophets. In the present chapter, then, a brief resumé of Paul's world will be followed by the summarizing of main features of his rhetoric. This summary will adhere to the form already established for rhetorical analyses in the preceding chapters, and will be followed by a summary of the world and rhetorical characteristics of the Old Testament prophets. Then the two rhetorical summaries will be compared, with these questions in mind: (1) What elements found in the rhetoric of the Apostle Paul are also found in Old Testament Hebrew prophetic rhetoric as seen in Amos, Hosea, and Micah? (2) Are there rhetorical elements in Paul's speeches that are not found in the traditional Hebrew rhetoric? (3) If so, are these "added" elements derived from Paul's employment of the canons and precepts of classical rhetoric? The conclusion will follow, along with implications of the study and suggestions for further investigation.

Summaries

The World of Paul

The ancient world-view which we would equate with the classical philosophy of the Greco-Roman world was idealistic. The Greco-Roman culture believed that Man was superior to other creatures and able to organize and maintain a Utopian society. Augustus implemented the philosophy of the Greeks that virtue and strength should be the characteristics and foundation of society, and he added to that the sense of the Roman Empire's divine mission in rulership.

However, the record of the Hellenistic era of Paul is that neither the Greeks nor the Romans possessed enough ethics to balance their intellectual endeavors. The empty self-exalting oratory of the Second Sophistic mirrored a civilization that would inevitably collapse. At the same time a sense of spiritual hunger prevailed among the Gentiles, and among the Jews who were looking with renewed eagerness for the promised Savior.

In ideology Paul really belonged to the idealistic classical era. The moral and intellectual content of Pauline theology contrasted with the emotional orgiastic ritualism of popular Oriental religions, the immorality of Greek gods, and the impersonal Roman deities. Paul's love for Christ, rather than for pleasure and self, contrasted sharply with Epicureanism. Every human being was of great worth in the Apostle's eyes, a value in direct opposition to the slavery, infanticide, and murderous "games" of the period. Paul also believed that man by nature was sinful and only Divine Love and grace could make him acceptable to God. He further believed that time moved constantly toward the grand culmination of God's imminent Kingdom--such views being antithetical to pagan ideas of endless cycles and the reign of Chance. Most importantly, the Apostle's experience on the Damascus Road molded and energized him, for thereafter he believed himself called by the risen Jesus to evangelize the Gentile world. His fulfillment of that call made Greek and Roman civilization memorable, and Christianity a religion powerful enough to mold the world's history, for it was the stirring eloquence of Paul that captured both pagans and Jews for Christ. The persuaded persuade.

The Rhetoric of Paul

What are the characteristic aspects of rhetoric in the sermons of Paul? The data presented in the foregoing chapters supply verifiable answers to this question, and reveal that the discourses of the Apostle are capable of analysis according to the classical criteria, with results that are highly creditable to Paul.

The Apostle's messages speak in and through their form, the structures becoming a means for persuasively communicating the contents. Paul had become acquainted with Old Testament prophetic rhetoric at home, in rabbinical school and at the synagogue, but he was also conditioned by rhetorical factors of his time, by the speech occasion, by his own world-view, and by his perception of the world-view of his audience.

The Response of the Audience to Each Sermon.--Like a deliberative orator in the classical tradition, Paul seeks to move his audience toward a specific course of action for their good. His purpose, aligned with that of classical rhetoric, is to give effectiveness to truth as he sees it, and persuade.

After Paul's sermon at Antioch, a deep silence is followed by pleas that Paul speak again, and many of the Jews and religious proselytes follow Paul and Barnabas who persuade them to continue in the grace of God. At Athens, some mock, others defer, but a few accept and believe, some of them notable people of the city. The experience of Paul at Athens confirms that the gospel is a universal message intended for all, and can be well-received by the Gentiles as well as the Jews. The elders of Ephesus are grieved at the thought of not seeing Paul again, but for long years they faithfully obey his exhortations and follow his example.

In each incident Paul achieves his goal, not simply adding to men's knowledge, but moving their wills to decisive action. Cicero defined the orator as a man who speaks in such a manner as to win his audience's assent.

Appropriateness of Themes to Occasion and Audience.--Rhetoricians have long recognized that a single theme is indispensable to effective communication, and that this thesis should be clearly defined and easily determined.[1] Each of Paul's addresses can be crystallized into a single sentence. At Antioch his message is to chiefly uneducated heathen, and his theme, that "God, according to promise, has brought to Israel a Savior, Jesus," is appropriate to the occasion in that it corresponds with the seder and haphtarah readings for that Sabbath. His theme is also appropriate to his audience of Jews, proselytes, and God-fearers, for it speaks to the religious needs of each group. Paul tacitly acknowledges the relative indifference of dispersion Jews and proselytes to promises concerning the Messianic throne, and focuses instead on their desire for the Messianic Savior. To the God-fearers his theme promises a full and equal salvation regardless of race or class. At Athens Paul explains that God is the Creator of the Universe and of men, a theme appropriate as an introductory lesson in Christianity for his audience of cultured, educated pagans. After acknowledging an inscription which reveals the Athenians' religious devotion and confessed ignorance, the Apostle proceeds with a theme that develops the true knowledge of God, contrasting this knowledge with the inconsistent worship of images. At Miletus he addresses Christians saying, "Be on guard for yourselves and for all the flock," this theme synthesizing the whole message. It is appropriate to the occasion of farewell and to church elders who have loved him for years, but who soon will face trouble and temptation.

On each occasion Paul reveals knowledge of the various strands of thinking within his audience, making only those assumptions which he believes they will grant. Thus, he is in line with the classic rhetorical injunction that the message must be adapted to the peculiar conditions of the audience and audience situation.[2] Messianic promises would have been meaningless to Greeks who, without accurate prior knowledge of God Himself, would have misunderstood an address about the Son of God. Contrastingly, a message against idolatry would have been irrelevant to Jews with their scrupulous abhorrence of graven images, but it was fitting to lead instructed Jews from knowledge of God to knowledge of God's Christ. The theme and content of each message is so singly adapted to the people and occasion of its utterance that no one of Paul's speeches in Acts would have been suitable in a different place or circumstance.

The Structure of the Sermons.--In Acts 13 Paul adapts to the customary ways of synagogue preaching by moving successively through a preliminary reference to the seder, an initial text linguistically related to the haphtarah, the standard process of haruzin, and a final text pointing back to the seder. His arrangement, though also historical, is chiefly a climactic, logical one based on the continuity of his inductive reasoning. Paul's *exordium*, *narratio*, *divisio*, *confirmatio*, *confutatio*, and *peroratio* are easily traced. The Apostle appears to follow Cicero's suggestion that when events have to be explained away by argument, it is wise to distribute the *narratio* throughout the speech. Paul's address is an exposition adapted to tactfully persuade of what has been done. He appears to apply the classical notion of *inventio* and *stasis*, making his point of dispute whether the crucified and risen Jesus is the promised Messiah and Savior. He also seems to employ Ciceronian Topics of Distribution of past and present, Cause and Effect, and Consistency. In his lines of argument Paul draws heavily on the Jewish Scriptures, confirming his own authority and the truthfulness of his teaching by a closely reasoned explanation of the relationship between the Jewish law and prophets, and the Christian gospel. His statements of fact are not scientifically demonstrated truth, but persuasive argument--that with which classical rhetoric concerned itself. Paul's *exordium* claims his audience as "brethren" and recalls the sacred narratives of Israel's history, while his *divisio* and *confirmatio* explain how the ancient convenants have come to be fulfilled. For Jews the fulfillment of prophecy in Christ was from the first the most effective approach. Here Paul links logical chains with oratorical pleading of God's promises already kept. (Cicero wrote that the greatest support of a probability is an example.) Paul refutes objections in his hearers' minds and his peroratio appeals for a response through the words of a prophetic oracle of warning to those who do not believe.

At the Areopagus in Athens pleaders are forbidden to affect the passions of their hearers, but Paul proves that for Gentiles the positive contents of Christianity can be sufficiently persuasive. The Athenians most respect arguments offered to their reason, and Paul uses largely Stoic arguments calculated to convince educated minds, with the Stoics' own deductive method of syllogistic reasoning.[3] Further, in keeping with the Stoic dialectic, Paul speaks briefly, simply, and without emotional appeals.

Rather than support a message to the philosophically oriented Athenians by references to a book about which they have little knowledge and confidence, the Apostle wisely cites familiar and weighty statements of their own poets, a common practice among Greek rhetoricians. Cicero believed that quoting poetry pleased the audience, revealed the speaker to be knowledgeable and intelligent, and enabled the sentiments of the poet to be used as witnesses to support the orator's statements. Choosing the Greek philosophical tradition as a common basis from which to give his diatribe enables Paul to criticize idolatry only with arguments commonplace in philosophical Greek thought since the sixth century B.C. He thereby lays down the fundamental principles of natural theology.

The partes orationis as given in the Ad Herennium and in Cicero's De Inventione are evident in Paul's speech. Also, following the traditional division found in Cicero's De Oratore, Paul first conciliates the audience, then states his case, and then establishes the point in controversy, refuting those who worship idols and concluding with a call to repentance and warning of coming judgment. He distributes his facts throughout his confirmatio, as the author of Ad Herennium and Cicero allowed. He also seems to have used the five speech processes Cicero considered necessary in preparing any oration, appearing to argue with the classical concept of inventio in view. His whole case turns on the point of dispute; the issue emerges out of the development of his ideas, out of the lines of argument, and he employs Cicero's Topics of Cause and Effect, and Consistency. Paul uses his power and judgment to vary the order of dispositio, as Cicero allowed when it suits the purpose of persuasion. Paul is also in line with the Ad Herennium's precept that one should not linger too long on the same topic, return to it repeatedly, leave it incomplete, or move on to another clumsily. In his careful logic of deductive reasoning, in his understanding of the Greek philosophical mind, and in his memory of literature, the Apostle fulfills Cicero's standards that the orator will have the subtlety of the logician, thoughts of the philosopher and memory of a lawyer.

Cicero advised that whenever he can, an orator should divert a controversy from particular circumstances or persons to universal abstract questions. Paul appears to follow this precept in that he takes the one idol designated as the Unknown God in a particular place and diverts what could be a controversy regarding the worship of this single idol to the proof of one universally exclusive, creating, all-pervasive God, thus proving the worship of all idols to be vain. The "perfect argument" of the *Ad Herennium* is seen here, also.

With apparent conscious purpose and knowledge Paul imitates the opening salutation common with Attic orators and occurring constantly in the speeches of Demosthenes. In his *exordium* he employs the classical rhetorical claim of presenting important new matter, thus making the audience well-disposed, attentive, and willing to receive information, as Cicero prescribed. The *confutatio* and *conclusio* of this first Christian apology to the Greeks climax with power.

Paul's sermon at Miletus is closely reasoned both inductively and deductively, being based upon the logic of demonstration through self-revelation. It follows the familiar structure of farewell addresses. The ethical appeal gives weight and power to the whole address. Paul uses personal examples as supporting material in order to give a clear pattern to follow, and to persuade. Of the arguments prescribed by classical rhetoric, one is the argument from probability including the man's previous life, dwelling on his merits, and thus creating a prejudice in his favor. In all of the loci discussed by Cicero, Paul finds arguments for making his audience well-disposed: in the speaker's character, in that of the audience, in that of his opponents (the "wolves"), and in the facts of the case. He uses Ciceronian topics of Distribution of past and present, and Consistency, and the Topic Questions of rhetoric. As at Antioch, he employs all three of Aristotle's primary modes of persuasion which Cicero recognized. He leads up to his divisio through a reminder of his example and an announcement of his departure. Then, after stating his main point, he explains it further and develops its implications. The full climax of this brief sermon is not in until his last vigorous words are spoken, a characteristic of classical orations.

In each of these sermons the Apostle selects those amplifying evidences and ideas that are the most familiar and convincing to his particular audience. The literature he cites, the people he quotes, the examples he gives, are all chosen in light of the unique characteristics of his immediate listeners. He is pre-eminently a logician if we understand this word in the context of rhetoric to mean one who competently marshals the evidence of probabilities.

Paul's habit is to speak with succinct and yet exhaustive inductive or deductive reasoning, purposeful and coherent; an ordered structure of systematic theological statement.[4] His logical or psychological arrangement follows words that bring the audience to an attitude of receptivity. Beginning with one main idea familiar to his hearers, he progressively brings them to a confrontation with God and leaves them with the necessity of responding in some way. Practically all of his speeches reveal evidence of having been thought out beforehand, showing no little preparation. He must have known at both Antioch and Athens that he would be given opportunity to speak, and at Miletus he, himself, planned for and provided his opportunity.

Analysis of Style and Delivery.--Paul's style follows Cicero's definition as "the result of amplification based upon thorough knowledge." Furthermore, like Cicero the Apostle seems to also base his style on psychology, experience, ethos, and pathos. If his listeners are Jewish, he sprinkles his speech with Hebraisms and flavors it throughout with Semitic expressions, idioms, and constructions, a conscious effort to express himself with propriety. If he is speaking to educated Greeks he includes Greek quotes and allusions, maintains his straightforward Attic style, and commands a large treasury of idiomatic phrases and vocabulary appropriate to cultured Greeks. His own intelligence and penetrating mind uses Greek philosophy to clothe Christianity in expressions familiar to those of his era. He employs the correct vernacular Koine, in most instances universally known, and found in any case of public speech in Greek. Finally, when Paul stands before Christians, he uses the characteristic phrases, words, terms, and ideas they have come to understand and associate with his ministry. In each sermon he consciously expresses himself in a manner appropriate to the nature and background of his listeners.

Paul exemplifies perspicuity by his thorough knowledge and understanding of ideas, his discerning vocabulary, simplicity of grammar, and direct discourse. His choices from among synonyms indicate his endeavor to be correct, precise, and clear. The body and conclusion of his messages follow classical lines of brevity, and are therefore correct in the Ciceronian sense. His avoidance of bombast is not only appropriate to the substance of his messages, but also in keeping with the classical views on rhetoric. In an age that increasingly cared for form rather than substance, delighting in exhibition and virtuosity, the direct, earnest, urgent style of the Apostle is significant and sharply delineated. In the clear, cogent style of Attic orators, Paul emphasizes the message rather than the speaker, relying on the spirit and power of God.

However, the rich, embellished style of Demosthenes was considered compatible with Attic perfection and purity, and Paul ornaments his orations with well-known classical figures of speech. He uses inversion, illustration, allusion, assonance, alliteration, analogy, contrast, repetition, rhythm, progression, suspense, and climax. He seems fond of metaphor and at Miletus uses it along with visual imagery and metonomy. At Antioch he includes the figure of answering questions in the minds of the audience, thus refuting their objections, and uses the figure of cumulative effect by collecting a sequence of facts. He achieves blunt forcefulness by employing direct discourse and asyndeton, a syntactical device employed with rhetorical effect, especially in admonition. All of his thoughts are expressed in a style of remarkable finish, rhythm, and eloquence without diminishing his natural intensity. Thus, the four virtues of style praised in *De Oratore*--propriety, correctness, perspicuity, and ornamentation--all appear in each of Paul's addresses.

The Apostle speaks not only with knowledge, but method and bearing, as Cicero prescribed. At Antioch Paul beckons for the attention of his audience as pagan orators often did, and at Ephesus he spreads forth his hands to give weight to his words and to convey earnest pleading. He demonstrates versatility by employing all three of the classical styles of delivery which, according to Cicero, will be used by the effective orator. At Antioch Paul's message is mainly delivered in the *plain* style which classical rhetoric used for instruction, his didactics flowing in clear, smooth, authoritative statement with little emotion. However, his speech rises to the rhythmic embellishments of the moderate style, and finally to the conceptions and passion of the grand style. At Athens the Apostle begins with the plain style for his courteous introduction, but speaks mainly in the eloquent rhythm of the moderate style, appropriate for listeners who love beauty combined with reason in rhetoric. His parting declaration is in the grand style of vehement persuasion. At Miletus Paul's message rises and falls with the ardent emotions of the speaker, and all three styles are employed. However, the grand style is the chief characteristic of this emotional, ethical speech. In each case he achieves his goal which comprehends Cicero's three aims of the orator: to instruct, to please, and to win.

Analysis of Pathos and Ethos.--Paul conveys intangible, yet important overtones of pathos and ethos that lead to the acceptance of his message. Like Cicero, he feels the emotions he seeks to arouse, combines them with ethos, logos, style, and delivery throughout the speech, and demonstrates that powerful proof is inherent in delivery which seems to come from the heart.

In Acts 13 the Apostle creates an atmosphere of love by his gentle treatment of the history of the Jewish nation, by fully identifying himself with his Jewish audience, and by speaking with concerned urgency and admonition. In Acts 17 he conveys an attitude of knowledgeable appreciation for his listeners' motives and religious devotion. He appeals to the Athenians' curiosity, pride in their religion, intelligence, and culture, and desire for self-preservation, always communicating a concern to be spiritually helpful. Thus, he approaches them from both the emotional aspect of their religious beliefs and the mental aspect of their highly sophisticated, intelligent culture. At Miletus, by means of tactful omissions and thorough yet modest reminders of his own example, the Apostle appeals chiefly to the elders' religious zeal, gratitude, and love. The pathetic appeal of his own goodwill stirs up a similar response in his hearers. This speech ranks foremost of all in earnest, sincere, impassioned eloquence.

At both Antioch and Athens, Paul warns of impending judgment if his message is not received and believed; at Antioch he offers justification from all sin through Jesus. At Miletus he speaks of spiritual reward for those faithful in service to Christ, but warns of coming opposition and division within the Church. Always, Paul employs emotion as a stimulus to the intellect rather than as a short-circuiting agency. He aims at the whole man. He conveys a basic mood of acceptance, the feeling that the speaker appreciates his audience and loves them for what they are. He speaks as one willingly yielded to a compelling power as great as that felt by the prophets.

In all three addresses Paul exemplifies the classical characteristics of ethos: virtue, competence, and goodwill. The Apostle's conviction of the virtuous worth of his message is the first secret of his convincing oratory, and carries with it as a corollary a sense of his personal responsibility and virtue. No rhetorical training is necessary to recognize his ardour. In Acts 13 virtue is suggested by Paul's prophetic oracle of warning which brings with it a sense of his godliness. Virtue is expressed in an attitude of helpful concern in Acts 17, through the proclamation of truth that leads to repentance and escape from judgment. In Acts 20 virtue speaks in a tone of strong admonition lest the Church established and beloved of God should suffer. At Miletus Paul also uses the proof and supporting material of his own virtuous example. In all three sermons he speaks as an ambassador of the living God. Classical rhetoric recognized that the perfection of the orator is based on nature as well as practice. The Apostle exemplifies sublime living, a strong, inspired emotion, dignity of mind, noble purpose, and vigor of mental conception such as "Longinus" had in mind when he spoke of excellence and high spirit in the orator.

Only Paul's deliberate opponents would doubt the competence of a man who had turned "the world upside down." Paul's authoritative note that his ministry is one he has received of the Lord Jesus is the corollary of the competence he displays in argument. He is also competent in his use of the Scriptures, in his knowledge of the true God, and in his acquaintance with Greek language and culture. He reasons by direct evidence with confidence, sincerity, tact and skill, gratifying the anticipation of the audience as quickly as possible. Typically, Paul intertwines logos with pathos and ethos, for out of the facts implied by his logic comes an emotion which he, himself, shares as part of his own clear convictions. The man and the message are one. Both an experiential and intellectual understanding of the risen Lord Jesus are his; his mouth competently speaks out of the fullness of his mind and heart. This ethos doubtless contributes toward a sensing of the truth in all he says. As Plato insisted in the Phaedrus, the truth must be known by the orator first.

Paul's goodwill leads his audience to listen as he commends what is praiseworthy, and interprets their lapses in the best light possible. He builds up the character of his listeners, meeting them where they are, and pointing them to where he wants them to be. He warns, admonishes, reproves and implores, presses, pleads and persuades to an obedient response. At Miletus, by linking his destiny with that of every Christian, by throwing a bond of love about them, Paul manifests an empathy, an identification that makes men not only trust him but be ready to die for him. His message at Miletus is one of the greatest examples of ethos in ancient oratory.

Zeal, dialectical energy, faith, love, humility, and genius characterize Paul's life and style. He adjusts to the "variables of human behavior" by modifying his remarks according to the known peculiarities of a particular audience. His adjustments in the context make it more appropriate, interesting and intelligible, while his adjustments in purpose, proof, and style, insure some response from his hearers.[5] Paul himself eloquently summarizes the total and complete adaptation that is necessary for the sake of persuasion: "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some."[6]

The World of the Prophets

Foretelling was not the chief concern of the Hebrew prophets; their primary function was to improve existing social and religious conditions, and their messages are still very relevant today.

Amos, Hosea, and Micah are representative of the Golden Age of Hebrew Rhetoric, and are classic examples of the Old Testament prophets who strove to keep Israel's religion ethical by holding morality and religion together. They laid the groundwork upon which Judaism and Christianity have been built. Amos is probably the oldest original source extant for the study of prophetic preaching, and the ministries of Hosea and Micah follow his so closely that most, if not all, of the speeches of these prophets are delivered in the turbulent half-century between 765 and 715 B.C.

Amos speaks in a day when great wealth is coming to Israel. Commercial success suddenly floods the hitherto deprived land with abundance; yet injustice, indulgence, and unfaithfulness spread until Jehovah is forsaken and "the poor are sold for a pair of shoes."

Hosea's first two chapters relate to the period of prosperity in which Amos lived, but the final messages reveal a reversal of circumstances leading to national collapse. The initial thrill of wealth fades, satisfaction for insatiable desires is sought in sensual and novel religious behavior, and civil war drains Israel's strength. The nation has rejected true knowledge, forgotten the law of God, and sinned against His long-suffering love.

By Micah's day, poverty has come, and greedy men bite and devour the poor, the widows, and the children in an attempt to bolster their own dwindling personal resources. In the face of commercial oppression and advancing Assyrian armies, Micah minimizes his emphasis upon fear while amplifying his promises of future well-being if the people will "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly" with Jehovah.

The Rhetoric of the Prophets

In spite of the prophets' chronological proximity, their speeches reveal differences in content and method, as well as similarities.

The Response of the Audiences to the Sermons.--Most of the heedless audience of Amos consider him to be a raver and a traitor. God's judgment falls and all but a remnant of repentant ones are slain. However, the long-range response has been that the revolutionary concepts of Amos concerning justice, judgment, suffering, and redemption have been incorporated and amplified in Hebrew-Christian views.

Though Hosea's message is one of enduring and evocative import, beauty, and power, whether he was successful at all is not fully known.

Micah is one of the few Hebrew prophets who succeed in making a definite immediate impression upon the social life of his nation. The impact of his message is felt in his own generation, in the days of Jeremiah, at the time of Christ, and in later centuries.

Appropriateness of Themes to Occasion and Audience.--Amos observes the crass injustices in the name of religion, and cries, "Let justice roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream!" He teaches that security and achievement are to be found in an ethical relationship with men which is coupled to fellowship with God. This theme is appropriate to the depraved lives of the audience and the occasion of impending judgment. Using 42 different concrete words which mean destruction, Amos is the unrelenting "Prophet of Doom."

Hosea witnesses gross idolatry in the name of true religion, and speaking from a real experience with the heart of God declares, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings." His theme, "O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God!" is especially appropriate since Jehovah's complaint is that His people are willfully ignorant of, and far from, God's heart. Exile impends for those who will not return to a faithful love relationship with Him. Hosea appropriately is titled "The Prophet of Love" and "The Prophet of Repentance."

Micah's message reveals propriety since Jehovah has a controversy with the house of Israel concerning their social and religious sins. Summarizing the messages of Amos and Hosea, Micah says, "He hath showed thee O Man what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

The Structure of the Sermons.--The care with which Amos chooses his occasion and his strategy of surprise makes this one of the most notable addresses in all of prophecy. He skillfully executes his introduction and initial command of the audience, gaining their accord by indicating enemy nations before abruptly citing the sins of Israel and her impending doom: "Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O Israel . . . For three transgressions of Judah and for four I will not turn away the punishment thereof. . . . The Lord will roar from Zion." Throughout this dramatic dialogue the logic of causal relationship either is inferred, stated, emphasized by rhetorical questions, or illustrated by example. However, in the progression of ideas there is an abundance of short clauses without continuity or flow.

Hosea gains his listeners' sympathy before declaring his message that "the Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land. . . . Hear this and hearken, for judgment is toward you." The prophet has no orderly plan of arrangement or sequence. Accusation, threats, calamities, promises and climaxes are found scattered in fragmentary units throughout his oration. His message is not declaimed in the form of a sermon but is structured in terms of a lively conversation. At times his speech seems to rush out as disconnected, unbalanced utterance with half-developed allusions. The only progress of thought discernible is the general category of Israel's guilt, punishment, and restoration, but even these topics are scattered throughout the chapters in small excerpts.

Micah traces from cause to effect, or joins an effect to other effects, or points from the effects to their antecedents, but these logical appeals are not organized into any formal argument. In the arrangement of his thoughts, abrupt and full of sharp contrasts, he is like Hosea. He reveals an excitable mind carried away by inward impulse, making rapid transitions from threatening to mercy, from vehement emotion to sympathetic tenderness. Micah begins on a note of open opposition with no other credentials than "The Word of the Lord": "Let the Lord God be witness against you . . . the Lord hath a controversy with His people." The prophet makes extensive use of the literary form of dramatic dialogue, and in some cases there is no regard for chronology when he speaks of things far and near without differentiating--two characteristics of ancient Hebrew prophetic rhetoric.

Analysis of Style and Delivery.--Some Hebrew scholars insist that Amos is an unlettered rustic, while others say there is no stronger, purer, or correct literary style in the entire Old Testament. The four classical virtues of style--propriety, correctness, perspicuity, and ornamentation--can be found in the speeches of Amos. In relation to the appropriate subject matter of denunciation of evil, the language he uses itself has propriety and a heightened effect. Vivid words, figures, and examples, and even the arrangement of these, exert an emotional impact. Perspicuity is gained by simple grammar, prolific but brief illustrations, transitional words, and repetition. Amos also has a thorough knowledge of his ideas, and uses discerning vocabulary and direct discourse with many rhetorical questions. His ornamentation includes antithesis, personification, suspense, progression, climax, and buccolic figures of the wilderness. The poetic parallelisms of Amos retain much of their poetic rhythm and symmetry of ideas in the English translation. His greatest strength is his impressive display of poetic rhythm along with forcefulness. His delivery moves from the moderate to the ardent grand style.

Hosea does not rely on a vital message alone to seize and hold the attention of an unfriendly audience. In an abrupt, hurried, emotional manner, he clamors for the attention of his apathetic countrymen, and thus exemplifies propriety in the precipitious circumstances of his day. He has no time for the niceties of parallelism and balancing of clauses, for well-considered perspicuity, or correctness. His grief and rebukes, his declarations of judgment, and his pleadings are artless and untrammelled. It has been declared that his speeches contain no trace of oratorical art. Clarity is aided by his thorough knowledge and discerning vocabulary which represent deep understanding of the ideas of forgiveness, repentance, and sin against love. Correctness suffers with clarity in his lack of continuity, abundant incomplete figures, fragmentary units, undeveloped references, and his intense emotion. His complex grammar includes the omission of connectives, and sudden, unexpected transitions. Hosea's most common sentence structure is the cumulative listing of charges followed by the devastating word "Therefore." In direct discourse and dramatic dialogue he often fails to indicate change of speakers, but he does colorfully convey the opposition and self-justification of those answering him. After speaking as one seeking sympathy, he turns quickly with staccato-like bursts to passionately amplify his accusations in the popular oriental poetic form. Of the three minor prophets studied, Hosea has the highest individual average of suggestive images, and he uses more similes and metaphors than any other Old Testament writer. Often he accumulates them in the spirit of Hebrew poetry, so that many beautiful passages occur, some of them sublime. He uses suspense and climax intermittently, and moves between the moderate and grand styles of speaking. His emotions are too intense to allow for the subdued style.

Micah is simple, direct, and provincial, thereby speaking with propriety as the champion of the poor. His Hebrew is correct and excellent, and his style is clear, though rigorous, even rough perhaps with abrupt transitions, but not uncultivated. Of the three prophets, Micah probably states his message with least ambiguity. He includes ornamentation through illustrations, examples, allusions, historical references, personification, antithesis, repetition, analogy, rhetorical questions, rhythm, progression, suspense, and climax. Similes and metaphors constitute his major use of examples and illustrations. No figures are extended or developed fully, but he reveals full knowledge of his ideas of justice, love, mercy, and loyalty to God. His discerning vocabulary aids a forceful, fresh delivery of brief, simple, but powerful statements. His style is measured and rhythmical; the only conscious art is his amazing series of plays on words in the panorama of invasion. He does not seek to conciliate his audience. He moves from words of moderate vehemence to the grand style of elevated, sublime language, and lightning flashes of indignation.

The prophets utilize the leading features of traditional Hebrew poetry, which are parallelism of lines and thought, variety of structure, and accentual rhythm, often highly patterned and pungent in form. They also use lamentations and the sublime though popular character of the oracle: an inspired rhythmical warning or promise.

Analysis of Pathos and Ethos.--Though there are elements of logic, authority, and ethos in their speeches also, the dominant factor of persuasion in the message of the prophets is emotion. Interestingly, percentages of appeals based upon fear decrease in the prophets' chronological order, even though during their period from 765 to 715 B.C., threats from external forces increase.

Amos, the "Prophet of Doom," is the most negative of the three prophets. He appeals to feelings of insecurity, guilt, and fear; however, he also attempts to arouse the people to desire success, integrity, and satisfaction.

Hosea also gives chief emphasis to pathos. His addresses are based on fear more often than faith. Because God's message has become incarnated in his own life, his speeches contain passages of unsurpassed tenderness intermingled with harsh judgment, revealing God's feelings for

His erring people. In his persuasive appeals, Hosea uses at least 11 of the 15 emotions discussed by Aristotle and Cicero. His grand style of speaking is made passionate by his own heart's emotion, coupled with the emotional content of his utterance.

The strongest and most characteristic motivation that Micah employs is the pathetic. He is not so strongly negative as are Amos and Hosea, but nevertheless his two most common appeals are to a sense of insecurity and to conscience. His promises of satisfaction are extended, but his strong indignation is directed against all prevailing injustices. He has no patience with selfish, greedy men, no matter what their "class." It is not difficult to see that Micah's message, regardless of the prophet's own ethos, inevitably would involve him in controversy.

The ethos of Amos includes no prophetic background. Nevertheless he claims divinely-given authority that came with God's command "Go prophesy!" In his messages Amos reveals competent knowledge gained through extensive travels, and strict objectivity concerning justice and judgment. Though Amos reveals his goodwill by identifying with his audience in intercession for them, the mark of a true prophet, he also conveys the pleadings, indignation, and wrath of Jehovah, speaking in the first person in the character of God. The audience can logically infer from the message that Amos is intelligent, courageous, and of good moral character.

Hosea exhorts the nation to come back to Jehovah Who is the Husband of the land, emphasizing that both he and God are long-suffering lovers who have been betrayed. Through his self-exposing message Hosea reveals himself to be virtuous, obedient, and faithful to God, competent and knowledgeable, courageous and strong, loving and merciful; but these revelations are not self-conscious. He speaks in the character, authority, and voice of Jehovah. The prophet makes no attempt to discover and appeal to the particular primary motives of his audience. He antagonizes them by recurring references to their disloyalty and infidelity, and by his words against the rulers and priests. Doubtless many wonder about the intelligence and character of a man who will let an adulteress go unpunished. Other skeptics will not recognize the selflessness, compassion and goodwill of the prophet beneath the severity of his controversy with idolatrous Israel.

Though Micah is a peasant who rises up to speak for the common people, his ignoble background and his circumscribed interest in his oppressed neighbors do not limit the scope of his prophetic ministry. In his struggle with justice and love he captures a universal idea of mercy which gives him great influence in his own and later generations. While he may not demonstrate the strong denunciation of Amos or the passionate love of Hosea, he is something of a combination of the character of Amos and Hosea. He is completely identified with his audience and their sins on one hand, as an intercessor, and with God as Judge and Lover on the other. Micah is the object of the Oppositions' conflict and resentment because his deep love for the nation does not deter his uncompromising message against national sins. He speaks in the power and inspiration of Jehovah, as the Voice of the God of Hosts that "crieth in the city." Though Micah makes no presentation of personal character, his virtue is subconsciously expressed by his strict moral code, implicit trust in God's rewards for righteousness, and selfless support of the cause of justice. Competence is evident in his foresight, and goodwill in his foretelling of the happy results of righteousness and his calls for a return to the ways of Jehovah.

The prophets capitalize on a universal interest in controversy when they voice their protest, stand in opposition, and come into open conflict. They are not satisfied with the status quo and advocate radical change. However, the prophet apparently cannot merely advocate a course of action: he cannot be positive only. He must have a controversy and create conflict by opposing that which is contrary to his message. The goal of the prophets is repentance and consensus.[7] The prophets and Paul all live with a most intimate sense of community with God.

Comparison of the Rhetoric of Paul and That of the

Prophets.--The following is a comparison of the rhetoric of the Christian prophet Paul and that of three ancient prophets of Israel. They served as definite parts of God's progressive revelation. They understood human nature and the common sins of humanity, and employed speaking techniques that would help them realize their goal of persuasion.

The Response of the Audience to the Sermons

The messages of Paul and the prophets presuppose response, not merely impression. Like the classical rhetoricians these orators seek to lead men to make a judgment and come to a decision. A few are persuaded at Athens, and a few are convinced in the days of Amos and perhaps Hosea. Numbers heed Paul's speeches at Antioch and Miletus, just as many respond to Micah's addresses in his day. Internal evidence and tradition attest the Scriptural assertion of these positive results. Further, in Paul's case, the Western World is the result of the fusion of Christianity and the Greco-Roman classical tradition, and this fusion was rendered possible through the energy, consecration, and skill of one who was an effective orator.

Appropriateness of Themes to Occasions and Audiences

The themes of Paul's messages and those of the prophets are appropriate to the occasions and audiences, determined by the purpose of God and given on the authority of His Word.

The Structure of the Sermons

For both Paul and the prophets the "given" nature of the gospel or prophecy favors inartistic proofs already existing and known to the speakers. However, in the area of composing and arranging Paul is far more self-conscious than the prophets, more deliberately organized and artistic, but without a secular orator's love of fame. The method of the prophets is the tradition of the prophets. They give little attention to form logic, or continuity of organization, emphasizing the proclamation of authoritative content. However, Paul, in the interest of argumentation, appears to emphasize systematic statement, following inductive or deductive reasoning to better communicate the total reality of the gospel. He seems to use the classical precepts of *inventio* and *dispositio*, with *stasis*, *Topics*, and *lines of argument*. His particular objectives determine the content of his speech. His planned sequence leads the mind on from one point to the next, and on to the next, which was the habit of the great classical orators, and the chief means of persuasion.

Paul's speeches are chiefly narrative and exposition, whereas the ancient prophets speak chiefly in dramatic dialogue. Paul's speeches show every sign of careful thought and preparation, having a beginning, middle, and end, unlike the more fragmentary proclamations and dialogue of the prophets. Paul's messages reveal knowledge of a formula behind them. Hebrew rhetoric had no formula.

Both the messages of the prophets and of Paul have at their core God's actions, promises, and conditions, and especially the newest word He has spoken. Facts are divinely placed in a new light, conveying a profound, evocative communication of meaning. Paul constantly quotes from the Old Testament as a ready-made source of evidence.

Analysis of Style and Delivery

Both Paul and the prophets speak with dramatic immediacy as heralds of a world crisis. The prophets do so because of their knowledge of impending doom; Paul does so because he believes the return of Jesus and the coming of God's kingdom are imminent. Both Paul and the prophets confront their audiences in face-to-face address, their unmemorized speeches heedless of posterity.

The fact that the prophets are nationalistic in outlook and concerned with Israel as a nation, while Paul is cosmopolitan and concerned with the known world, creates differences in their language and style. All use the common language and idioms of the people: the speech of the Jews is used by the prophets and Paul, but the Apostle also employs the vernacular speech, vocabulary, and idioms of the Empire. Paul's speech is not like the affected "eloquence" of Asiatic pompousness, however; he doubtless knows of Jesus' warning against heaping up "empty phrases as the Gentiles" (Matthew 6:7). His discourses exemplify the chief requirements of Attic oratory, being straightforward, plausible and economical.

The rhetoric of the prophets no doubt affects Paul very much, but not to the exclusion of the Greek influence. The prophets use such Old Testament images as Israel as a son, wife, or vineyard, and they continually reshape and combine these with fresh figures and expressions. Paul similarly recreates the religious vocabulary of the Old Testament, using new variations and new resources of all kinds. However, he includes Greek imagery, literary culture, illustrations, philosophy, law, and history as well, knowledge of which played a large part in Cicero's own theory of oratory, and upon which the Roman orator prided himself. The prophets utilize the leading features of Hebrew poetry along with the oracle traditionally heard in Old Testament prophecy. Paul also uses the oracle and ornamentation of rhythmic language, adapting meter to content, but in his orations in Acts he uses few poetic parallelisms, close patterns, or lyricisms and lamentations. Paul and the prophets both choose examples or illustrations from life, speak of visions, proceed from the known to the unknown, and use figures of speech to accommodate their truth to the understanding of their hearers. St. Augustine points out figures, taught in the art of rhetoric, that are present in Paul's speeches, but in his formal orations the Apostle uses such figures judiciously.

Paul demonstrates all four of the stylistic virtues prescribed by Cicero, but the prophets do not consistently demonstrate perspicuity, and Hosea does not always exemplify correctness. Paul uses all three classical styles of delivery, with one particular style predominant in each speech studied. The messages of the prophets are incompatible with the subdued style, and they do not use it. They speak chiefly in the grand style of vehement persuasion. Of course, the prophets are not teaching something new; they are trying to rouse their people to practice what they already know they should do; Paul _is_ teaching something new as well as trying to persuade, so that the teaching style is appropriate for him. Paul alone does not attempt to move until he has convinced, or to convince until he has conciliated--an order of progress found in _De Oratore_.

Since message is transcendent to the Apostle and the prophets, their emphasis is more upon it than on the style of presentation. However, the style emphasis appears to be a matter of degrees. The prophets seem to give _little_ studied attention to it, Paul seems to pay _more_ attention to it, as the classical rhetoricians did, and orators of the Second Sophistic pay _most_ attention to it, having little content to communicate.

Analysis of Pathos and Ethos

Both Paul and the prophets speak from the heart, presupposing the urgency that gives effectiveness to truth. Though the prophets are always rational, their emotion and emotional appeal seem to predominate, whereas Paul's reasoning is usually foremost. This is not to say that Paul's speeches are not directed to the heart also, for they are directed to the whole man, and Paul was too well-acquainted with the sublimity and tenderness of the Psalms not to sometimes teach with this language, persuading with emotional power. But his emotions are controlled and adapted to his audience. The prophets' natural emotion and fervor are not always orderly. Paul's affections and anxiety for the salvation of all those outside of Christ sometimes rise spontaneously into sentences of sustained and noble eloquence; nevertheless, in the interest of argument he appears to emphasize reason and logical form, placing truth in the most advantageous light for conviction and persuasion.[8]

Paul is much more conciliatory toward his listeners than are Amos, Hosea, or Micah. Neither Paul nor the prophets are willing to sacrifice their authoritative, unchanging central message to the nature and preferences of the audience. However, Paul is tactful in treating unpalatable truths, and adjusts details of his message to the nature, tenor, and comprehension of his listeners. The prophets give little evidence of audience adaptation. They begin with and maintain a note of open controversy and opposition which predominates. Paul begins on a note of positive support, empathy, and appreciation. The point of controversy in his message is reserved for the end of his systematic explanation and argument, and is its climax along with a warning to heed the final revealed truth. In this way the Apostle conciliates his audience and maintains their favorable hearing until his argument is complete.

The audience-oriented classical rhetoric of Cicero was chiefly concerned with the goal and means of persuading men. Though Paul is message-oriented like the prophets, and does not altar the heart of his message for anyone, since he is concerned with the goal of persuasion he significantly modifies and adapts details of his message and his style in order to present acceptable ethos. No one knows better than Paul that the Torah must speak in the language of men. He is close to the people and on each occasion speaks as one fully conscious of the peculiarities involved in the specific situation. Though he is the power and incarnation of his message, as are the prophets under the Law, beyond that he exemplifies the grace of God forming and adapting the message to men according to their needs, and singularly directing each speech to the unique occasion and circumstance. Though the prophets are wholly nationalistic, they are set apart and seldom make adjustments to the conventional climate in the fashions and manners of their time.

Both Paul and the prophets met all contacts with tremendous earnestness, and adverse situations with undauntable courage. They felt their authority rested in their divine calling. The prophets spoke in the Name of Jehovah: "Thus saith the Lord." Paul spoke in his own person but from the Spirit of the risen Christ. Their words resound with conviction. Their own personalities are humbled and exalted in the transcendent context of their messages. Paul gives the purpose for his life in Galatians 1:15 which is a seemingly intentional echo of the call of Jeremiah. Ethos in the prophets was based on their belief that God was before and above them; Paul believed that God was not only before and above, but IN him (Colossians 1:27). The tone of authority heard in these men's speeches proceeds from their perception of principles of authoritative truth.[9]

Classical orators reveal interest in the effect upon the audience of evinced qualities of virtue, competence, and goodwill. Paul and the prophets demand the actual possession of these qualities, and unconsciously reveal them in an inevitable display of character.[10] The good qualities are never simulated as they can be by a pagan rhetorician. However, the prophets have little or no interest in the effect of their own personalities and characters upon the audience, whereas Paul pays attention to ethos, and is careful to convey his personal warmth, competence, and goodwill, sometimes deliberately presenting his own character as proof of the truth he presents. Paul is a man of broader and deeper culture than the three prophets, and than that offered by the rhetoric-centered schools alone. He is more like Cicero's ideal orator of universal knowledge. Because he conveys himself as well as his ideas and convictions, ethos is a distinguishing characteristic. In fact, perhaps Paul's greatest contribution to rhetoric is in his example of Quintilian's classical dictum that the good orator must be a just man speaking well. As Augustine asserted, in matters where opinion can be divided, men most heed and trust an orator of virtue and integrity.

As the promulgators of virtues which are a preserving salt in society, the prophets and Paul have no equals among men. The values inevitably associated with their communications are those values incorporated in Plato's emphasis on morality in public speaking, and Paul was most responsible for the propagation of those values to the western world.[11]

The Conclusion

In the speeches from Acts one finds no blemishes from a purely rhetorical standpoint, and certainly not with the matter either. What then should be our conclusion regarding Paul the orator? In the three addresses studied from Acts and compared to Hebrew prophetic rhetoric, does he give sufficient evidence to prove that he has knowledge of classical precepts of rhetoric, and uses them? Or are his messages purely a result of inspired, unstudied discourse?

The conclusion of this dissertation is that the intellectual life of classical eloquence and the spiritual life of traditional Hebrew rhetoric, including the voices of the prophets, intermingle in the rhetoric of Saint Paul. He adds to traditional prophetic rhetoric a Greco-Roman eloquence that appears to be derived from his employment of the lofty precepts of classical rhetoric. The Apostle's speeches exemplify the addition of this rhetoric in the areas of structure, style, delivery, and ethos; and they do so in the following ways:

1. Structure (inventio and dispositio): Paul gives first place to the processes of invention and arrangement, employing reason and skill in argumentation as the foremost factor in his messages. The message of the gospel requires a pattern of argumentation beyond what Judaism and the language of the prophets offer, and Paul's analytical mind also seems to demand logical, intelligent structure. He appears to have found this desired framework in inventio, the partes orationis, and other guidelines of classical rhetoric, a distinguishing characteristic of which was its intellectual emphasis. In terms of the canon of dispositio, Paul's speeches are flawless, and show every sign of the formula of classical rhetoric behind them. By emphasizing systematic statement and inductive or deductive reasoning, Paul better communicates the total reality of the gospel, with the purpose of persuading his audience to a right response.

2. Style (elocutio): Paul deliberately gives attention to style, without putting it in first place as the

Second Sophistic would. His speeches are audience-oriented, like those of classical rhetoricians, in that he adjusts details of his message and molds his style to each unique group of listeners. His conciliatory manner and approach, his tactful treatment of unpalatable truths, his adaptation to the conventional climate and manners of the occasion, including the necessary vocabulary and articulation, all maintain his listeners' attention until the completion or near-completion of his systematic argument. Not all of his meaning is in until his last vital words are spoken--a characteristic of classical orators.

Paul follows the example of Greek orators in his opening greeting, and in supportive, empathetic remarks that bring the audience to an attitude of receptivity. He speaks in the straightforward, universally accredited style of the Attic orator, in keeping with the classical views on rhetoric, not in "eloquent," weak human "wisdom," or with the "lofty words" of Asiatic orators. He consistently demonstrates all four of Cicero's virtues of style.

3. *Delivery (actio)*: The Apostle seems to imitate Greek orators in his gestures and in his use of all three classical styles of delivery. In each case he achieves his goal which comprehends Cicero's three aims of the orator: to instruct, to please, and to persuade.

4. *Ethos*: Ethos is a distinguishing characteristic in Paul's rhetoric, as well as an emphasis in the classical

position, and one of the classical modes of persuasion which he uses. He speaks in his own person as pagan orators do, though from the Spirit of Christ, exemplifying Quintilian's "good man speaking well." He possesses the classical qualities of virtue, competence, and goodwill, and takes care to present these to the audience as well as unconsciously displaying them. Paul is the incarnation of Cicero's ideal orator of broad culture and knowledge, drawing on a wide field of secular as well as spiritual erudition: the Apostle uses Old Testament vocabulary, with fresh variations, together with new resources of Greek imagery, mythological symbolism, illustrations, literature, history, law, and philosophy.

Even Paul's individualism, the stamp of his rich personality on each speech, is allowed for within the scope of classical humanistic rhetorical precepts. Cicero, considered to be one of the greatest and most exemplary orators of the classical period, said that the individualism of the orator himself must be developed.

Though Paul's message was of the "given" nature of the gospel, and his Source of authority was God's call, not his own ability to persuade, still his expression of absolutes did not eliminate his use of classical rhetoric as it beneficially and persuasively presented that message. Classical rhetoric allowed for his revelation and inspiration, and for adornments of speech resulting from the glory and splendour of his subject.

Paul's eloquence seems largely due to informal but constant dealings with Greek rhetoricians, along with his recognition that new spiritual experiences require a reshaping of traditional methods of communication. Though how conscious Paul was of using classical rhetoric cannot be positively ascertained, it does not seem logical to say, of speeches as carefully prepared as those in Acts, that Paul was unconscious of using guidelines which in practice are so skillfully followed.

Further, the genius of God Who prepares His instruments cannot be overlooked. Just as God used all the knowledge and wisdom of Egypt to prepare Moses to be the competent leader of a new nation, so it appears that He used Paul's knowledge of Greek rhetoric to present the Good News to the Gentiles. As no other disciple, Paul combined the emotions of the Hebrew, the endurance of the Roman, and the intellect of the Greek. God calls men in the light of their abilities and places them in the line of their capacities. How altogether fitting that a reasonable and wise God should call a doctor of the Gentiles to be His instrument to present the systematic theological statements of the Gospel to the Gentiles, and thereby to the world. The Lord reveals His comprehensive grace by forming and adapting the Good News of His grace to different audiences through a man equipped to become "all things to all men" in order to "by all means save some."

St. Augustine, through his writings, bridged the gap between classical rhetoric and Christian rhetoric, but years earlier it seems that the Missionary to the Gentiles had already consciously but not ostentatiously demonstrated the viability of that bridge by constructing it himself with his own spoken example.

Implications of the Study

1. Inspiration does not exempt the orator from personal effort, nor does it insure the perfection of his work from an artistic point of view. God can prepare the instrument beforehand, and often does, but at the time of using it He does not usually make any change in it, aside from the inspiration of His Spirit.

2. Paul's ethos and the lives of the prophets hold implications for modern rhetoric. Since Plato wrote the Phaedrus the best of men have acknowledged that the chief requirements for communcation are virtue and knowledge--knowledge both of truth and of art. Ethical and informed communication is not produced by petty men engrossed in materialism. As "Longinus" explained, it is because few men lead sublime lives that few orators attain to the heights of sublimity. Cicero and Quintilian recognized the necessity of linking rhetoric with ethics; and the central issue in modern speech education is the relationship of ethics to rhetoric. When rhetoric is preceded by dialectic, inasmuch

as dialectic is based upon philosophical concepts of reality and truth, the inevitable relationship between honest rhetoric and truth then results. The ancient absolutes recommended and practiced by Paul and the prophets in their oratory appear more relevant to our needs today than the words of public figures who seem to prefer vanity and vice over virtue and service.

3. Pagan learning can be advantageous for an ardent defender of the truth. As Gamaliel was trained in Hellenistic philosophy, literature, and rhetoric, in order to be of greater use to his sect, and Paul used his knowledge of Greek culture to be of greater use to the One Who called him to be Apostle to the Gentiles, so the disciples of Jesus today ought also to consider the advantages of secular learning for those who would defend His truth in modern times.

Secular precepts of rhetoric should be taught and used in preaching the Word of God, when the principles of rhetoric stress ethics, earnestness, and sincerity, eloquence disciplined with culture, the importance of a single central thought being brought to the hearers, and the treatment of a subject from different points of view, without monotony, practical, and attractive.

To be able to put the Gospel of Jesus Christ into the language of the people is one of the greatest needs of our times, and it is a requirement to which each Christian today must continuously apply himself. This quality was one of the most outstanding in the preaching of Paul. He took the Gospel which was phrased in Oriental terms and gave it an Occidental appeal by rethinking and rephrasing it. By understanding Paul more fully, we come into better position to herald the Good News to our own generation. We can more clearly define what Christian preaching ought to be, and the needs and requirements of the present-day preacher or witness of the Gospel.

Intellectualism and mysticism are not mutually exclusive. However, intellectualism alone can be used with an audience whose spiritual growth is small and precludes the more philosophical, mystical approach. The methods of Paul reveal his adaptation to such classes of people, for where he cannot speak so philosophically, he speaks simply and of basic, elemental things. Nevertheless, his mysticism is only under the surface; and it emerges to mingle with his intellectualism for audiences capable of receiving it.

Then logos and Mythos, rhetoric and mysticism, are not mutually exclusive. Beyond logos, in Mythos, is the relationship of God and man. By logos man gives a name to this communion, and so communicates its reality to others. The Mythos, apprehension of the spiritual, needs the logos, word, reason, rhetoric, with which to communicate its apprehension. The Mythos itself, however, must be firmly attached to the Logos, or it is meaningless mysticism. From the beginning the Logos was and is Idea, Concept, and Thought as well as verbal speech, and is the Eternal Word of God, Incarnate, the Personal Mediator, intercommunicating with God and identical with God. Mythos is about that Logos, exalting and describing Him and the mysticism surrounding Him, so that the two are inextricably bound together. Hence, there is the logos--word--rhetoric of man used to declare the wonder of Mythos that emanates from the reality of the Logos. As Descarte so aptly wrote, "All words lead to The Word" Which was "in the beginning." Therefore, Paul deemed it appropriate to use the Greek world's rhetoric to present to all men the living Word of God.

Suggestions for Further Study

1. This is only the beginning of a study of the rhetoric of Paul in the light of his age, and in the light of the rhetoric of the prophets. Much more can be and should be said.

2. Is there any prophetic or Biblical example of a speaker who uses only the call to faith, while neglecting negative appeals based upon some element of fear? If there are such examples of positive speakers in the Bible or in traditional Christianity, a study of their motivation devices would strengthen the position of advocates of the supreme power of positive thinking and positive motivations. In the Scriptures it seems that speakers who omit negative truths and appeals are called false prophets who speak a

human message without divine insight or inspiration.

3. An interesting study would be that of the relationship between Pauline doctrine and social-political rhetoric and behavior.

4. It would be helpful to investigate the origin and history of divine inspiration as used in spoken or written sacred communication, as Paul and others utilized it. The philosophers of Greece and Rome tended to be religious agnostics and hence lacked belief in inspiration by gods and goddesses. The masses of people who were religious, however, had much faith in oracles and in the prophets who uttered divinely inspired truths.

5. Any of the individual major works referred to is subject for a study of sources, terminology, concept, and influence.

FOOTNOTES

[1] William Norwood Brigance, *Speech: Its Techniques and Disciplines in a Free Society* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952), p. 35. Cf. also the discussions in Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace, *Fundamentals of Public Speaking* (3rd ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960), pp. 146-48, 346-48; Milton Dickens, *Speech: Dynamic Communication* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1954), pp. 58, 254-56, 267-71; Raymond S. Ross, *Speech Communication: Fundamentals and Practice* (2nd ed.; Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 117; Alma Johnson Sarett, Lew Sarett, and William Trufant Foster, *Basic Principles of Speech*, ed. Wayne C. Minnick (4th ed.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966), p. 215; and Paul L. Soper, *Basic Public Speaking* (2nd ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), pp. 43-47.

[2] For further discussion regarding Paul's remarkable adaptation to time, place, and audience, see the following: A. T. Robertson, *Epochs in the Life of St. Paul: A Study of Development in St. Paul's Career* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1909), pp. 114, 115; John A. Broadus, "The Apostle Paul as a Preacher," in *Sermons and Addresses* (7th ed.; New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1886), p. 140; Charles N. Pickell, *Preaching to Meet Men's Needs: The Meaning of the Acts as a Guide for Preaching Today* (New York: Exposition Press, 1958), p. 20; and Joel Swartz, "The Eloquence of St. Paul," *The Quarterly Review*, New Series, II (July, 1872), 426.

See also Colossians 4:5, 6 for Paul's advice regarding audience adaptation.

[3] See William M. Sattler, "Some Platonic Influences in the Rhetorical Works of Cicero," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 25 (April, 1949), 168.

[4] The importance of clear organization to successful speaking has been demonstrated by several experiments in communication. It has been found that when the parts of a speech are presented in random order, the audience is not only unpersuaded by the speaker's message, they are actually influenced against it. Listeners are more interested in a

topic and willing to discuss it when the material is coherently presented to them. Organization also has a major effect on how much a listener will comprehend and retain of a message. Investigations show that as disorganization increases, audience comprehension and retention tends to decrease. Further, listeners exposed to a disorganized speech think less of the speaker after hearing his talk than before he began to speak.

For more details regarding these investigations see the following articles: Raymond G. Smith, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Speech Organization upon Attitudes of College Students," Speech Monographs, 18 (November, 1951), 292-301; Ernest Thompson, "An Experimental Investigation of the Relative Effectiveness of Organizational Structure in Oral Communication," Southern Speech Journal, 26 (Fall, 1960), 59-69; Donald K. Darnell, "The Relation Between Sentence Order and Comprehension," Speech Monographs, 30 (June, 1963), 97-100; Donald L. Thistlethwaite, Henry deHaan, and Joseph Kamenetsky, "The Effects of 'Directive' and 'Nondirective' Communication Procedures on Attitude," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51 (1955), 107-13; Harry Sharp, Jr., and Thomas McClung, "Effects of Organization on the Speaker's Ethos," Speech Monographs, 33 (June, 1966), 182-84.

[5] See Sarett, Sarett, and Foster, Basic Principles of Speech, p. 321; Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 55; Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism: The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal (New York: The Ronald Press, 1952), p. 360; Wayne C. Minnick, The Art of Persuasion (2nd ed.; Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1968), pp. 253-55.

[6] I Corinthians 9:19-22.

[7] "The goal of rhetorical discourse is consensus, the transformation of issue perceptions, bringing about a realignment and reconciliation between perceptual disparities, and thus the resolution of conflict created by such disparities." (Underlining mine.) This quote is taken from an article by David M. Hunsaker and Craig R. Smith, "The Nature of Issues: A Constructive Approach to Situational Rhetoric," Western Speech Communication, 60 (Summer, 1976), 115, 156. Cf. Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, pp. 22, 23.

[8] See Hugh Blair's definition of "true eloquence" in his Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres (London: W. Strahn, T. Cadell in the Strand; and W. Creech, in Edinburgh, 1784), p. 314.

[9] See Baskerville's interesting discussion on the relationship between authority and the perception of truth in "Emerson as a Critic of Oratory," Southern Speech Journal, 18 (March, 1953), 150-162.

[10] Ethical proof occupies a conspicuous place in Pauline oratory, such proof being capable of evaluation according to the classical criteria. Concise ethical summaries in the Apostle's own words are to be found in Ephesians, Chapter 5; Romans, Chapter 12; I Corinthians, Chapter 13, and I Thessalonians, Chapters 4 and 5.

[11] See Edwin Black's discussion of morality and values in public speaking, in "Plato's View of Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 44 (December, 1958), p. 374.

[12] Donald Bryant speaks of the philosophical outlook which belongs to the classical viewpoint, in his article "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 39 (December, 1953), 417.

EXTRA 100% RAG

APPENDIXES

CRANE'S THESIS PAPER
EXTRA 100% RAG

APPENDIX A

THE JEWISH LECTIONARIES

THE JEWISH LECTIONARIES

The One-Year Cycle[1]

The Sabbaths		The Law	The Prophets
Bereshit[2]	Genesis	1:1 - 6:8	Isaiah 43:5-43:11
Noah		6:9 -11:32	Isaiah 54:1-55:5
Lekh Lekha		12:1 -17:27	Isaiah 40:27-41:16
Vayera		18:1 -22:24	II Kings 4:1-37
Hayei Sarah		23:1 -25:18	I Kings 1:1-31
Toledot		25:19-28:9	Malachi 1:1-2:7
Vayetze		28:10-32:3	Hosea 12:13-14:10
Vayishlah		32:4 -36:43	Hosea 11:7-12:12
Vayeshev		37:1 -40:23	Amos 2:6-3:8
Miketz		41:1 -44:17	I Kings 3:15-4:1
Vayigash		44:18-47:27	Ezekiel 37:15-28
Vayehi		47:28-50:26	I Kings 2:1-12
Shemot	Exodus	1:1 - 6:1	Isaiah 27:6-28:13;29:22-23
Vaere		6:2 - 9:35	Ezekiel 28:25-29:21
Bo		10:1 -13:16	Jeremiah 46:13-28
Beshalah		13:17-17:16	Judges 4:4-5:31
Yitro		18:1 -20:23	Isaiah 6:1-7:6;9:5-6
Mishpatim		21:1 -24:18	Jeremiah 33:25-26;34:8-22
Terumah		25:1 -27:19	I Kings 5:26-6:13
Tetzavveh		27:20-30:10	Ezekiel 43:10-27
Ki Tisa		30:11-34:35	I Kings 18:1-39
Vayakhel		35:1 -38:20	I Kings 7:40-50
Pekudei		38:21-40:38	I Kings 7:51-8:21
Vayikra	Leviticus	1:1 - 5:26	Isaiah 43:21-44:23
Tzav		6:1 - 8:36	Jeremiah 7:21-8:3;9:22-23
Shemini		9:1 -11:47	II Samuel 6:1-7:17
Tazria		12:1 -13:59	II Kings 4:42-5:19
Metzora		14:1 -15:33	II Kings 7:3-20

---

[1] Taken from "Readings of the Law," The Encyclopedia of the Jewish Religion, ed. by R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and Geoffrey Wigoder (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966), pp. 324-25.

[2] The sabbaths are named from some signature word in the opening of the Hebrew seder.

The Sabbaths	The Law	The Prophets
Aharei Mot	16:1 -18:30	Ezekiel 22:1-19
Kedoshim	19:1 -20:27	Amos 9:7-15
Emor	21:1 -24:23	Ezekiel 44:15-31
Behar	25:1 -26:2	Jeremiah 32:6-27
Behukotai	26:3 -27:34	Jeremiah 16:19-17:14
Bemidbar Numbers	1:1 - 4:20	Hosea 2:1-22
Naso	4:21- 7:89	Judges 13:2-25
Behaalotekha	8:1 -12:16	Zechariah 2:14-4:7
Shelah	13:1 -15:41	Joshua 2:1-24
Korah	16:1 -18:32	I Samuel 11:14-12:2
Hukkat	19:1 -22:1	Judges 11:1-33
Balak	22:2 -25:9	Micah 5:6-6:8
Pinhas	25:10-30:1	I Kings 18:46-19:21
Mattot	30:2 -36:13	Jeremiah 2:4-28;3:4
Devarim Deuteronomy	1:1 - 3:22	Isaiah 1:1-27
Vaethanan	3:23- 7:11	Isaiah 40:1-26
Ekev	7:12-11:25	Isaiah 49:14-51:3
Reeh	11:26-16:17	Isaiah 54:11-55:5
Shopetim	16:18-21:9	Isaiah 51:12-52:12
Ki Titze	21:10-25:19	Isaiah 54:1-10
Ki Tavo	26:1 -29:8	Isaiah 60:1-22
Nitzavim	29:9 -30:20	Isaiah 61:10-63:9
Vayelekh	31:1 -30	Isaiah 55:6-56:8
Haazinu	32:1 -52	II Samuel 22:1-51
Vezot Haberakhah	33:1 -34:12	Joshua 1:1-18

The Three-Year Cycle[1]

The Sabbaths	The Law	The Prophets[2]
Nisan (April) Genesis	1:1 - 2:3	Isaiah 42:5;45:17-25;46:13
	2:4 - 3:21	Isaiah 42:5
Passover[3]	3:22- 4:26	II Kings 23:21;Isaiah 42:

---

[1] Taken from R. G. Finch, The Synagogue Lectionary and the New Testament; a Study of the Three-Year Cycle of Readings from the Law and the Prophets as a Contribution to New Testament Chronology (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1939), pp. 22-31.

[2] The reader was free to choose from these suggested haphtaroth, or to select a haphtarah of his own if it was appropriate to the seder for the day.

[3] Since the special holidays were occasions for public reading, they were incorporated into the three-year lectionary cycle.

The Sabbaths	The Law	The Prophets
		8;43:27;Jeremiah 22:30
	5:1 - 6:8	Isaiah 30:8-15;Ezekiel 38:10,13
	6:9 - 7:24	Isaiah 54:9-10
Iyyar (May)	8:1 -14	Jeremiah 21:20;31:20; Habakkuk 3:2-5
	8:15- 9:17	Isaiah 42:7-21;Micah 7:9
	9:18-10:32	Isaiah 49:9-13
	11:1 -32	Zephaniah 3:9-19
	12:1 -13:18	Joshuah 24:3-14;Isaiah 40:27
Sivan (June)	14:1 -24	I Kings 10:9;Isaiah 41:2-4
Pentecost	15:1 -21	Isaiah 1:1-17;Zephaniah 3:9-19
	16:1 -16	Isaiah 64:1
	17:1 -27	Isaiah 54:10;63:10-11; Jeremiah 33:25
	18:1 -33	II Kings 4:1;15-16;Isaiah 33:17-34:8;34:12-35:10
	19:1 -38	Judges 19:22-24;Isaiah 17:14-18:17;Malachi 3:18-19
Tammuz (July)	20:1 -18	Judges 9:22;Isaiah 61:9-10
	21:1 -34	I Samuel 2:21-27
	22:1 -19	Judges 3:1;Isaiah 33:7-22
	22:20-24	I Kings 1:1;Isaiah 51:1-11
	23:1-20	
	24:1-41	Judges 19:20
AB (August)	24:42-67	Isaiah 12:3-14:2
	25:1 -18	II Samuel 5:7-6:1
	25:19-26:11	Isaiah 65:23-66:8;Malachi 1:1
	26:12-35	Isaiah 62:8-63:7
Elul (September)	27:1 -27	I Samuel 2:2;Isaiah 46:3-47:4
	27:28-28:8	Micah 5:6-13;6:8;Malachi 1:1-14
	28:10-29:30	Hosea 11:7;12:13
	29:31-30:21	I Samuel 1:1-10;Isaiah 60:15
Tisri (October)		
New Year	30:22-31:2	I Samuel 1:11-22;2:1-10
Atonement	31:3 -32:3	Jeremiah 30:10-16;Hosea 11:7;Micah 6:3-7:20
Tabernacles	32:4 -33:18	Hosea 12:13;Obadiah 1-21; Zechariah 14:1-19

The Sabbaths	The Law	The Prophets
	33:19-35:8	Nahum 1:12-2:5
	35:9 -36:43	II Samuel 16:21;Isaiah 43:1-21
	37:1 -36	Isaiah 32:18-33:6,18; Jeremiah 38:8
Cheshvan (November)	39:1 -23	Isaiah 40:21;52:3-53:5; Amos 1:3-9
	40:1 -23	Amos 1:3-15;2:6
	41:1 -37	I Kings 3:15;Isaiah 29:8-14
	41:38-42:17	Isaiah 11:2-9
Kisleu (December)	42:18-43:13	Isaiah 44:14;50:10;52:11;
	43:14-44:17	I Kings 3:15;Jeremiah 2:4;42:12-17;43:12-14
	44:18-46:27	Joshua 14:6;Ezekiel 37:15
Dedication	46:28-47:27	I Kings 18:31;Zechariah 4:2
Tebeth (January)	47:28-31	I Kings 2:1;13:14
	48:1 -22	I Kings 2:1;II Kings 13:14
	49:1 -26	Isaiah 43:1;Micah 2:12
	49:27-50:26	Isaiah 48:12;Zechariah 14:1-11
Shebat (February)		
Exodus	1:1 -22	Isaiah 27:6-28:5;Jeremiah 1:1;3:1-25;Ezekiel 16:1;20:1-29
	2:1 -25	
	3:1 -4:17	II Kings 20:8;Isaiah 40:11-31
	4:18- 6:1	Isaiah 55:12-56:7
	6:2 -30	Isaiah 42:8-21;Ezekiel 28:25-29:21
Adar (March)	7:1 -8	Joel 3:3
	7:9 - 8:15	Joel 2:30-3:18
	8:16- 9:35	Isaiah 34:11-35:10
	10:1 -29	I Samuel 6:6-14;Isaiah 19:1-25;Jeremiah 46:13
	11:1 -10	Nahum 1:9
Nisan (April)	12:1 -12	Ezekiel 45:16,18
	12:13-20	
	12:21-28	Joshua 5:2
Passover	12:29-36	Joshua 3:5;Isaiah 21:11
	12:37-51	
	13:1 -16	Isaiah 46:3-4
	13:17-14:14	Judges 4:4;II Samuel 22:1-51;Isaiah 10:32-11:16
	14:15-16:3	Isaiah 49:10

The Sabbaths	The Law	The Prophets
Iyyar (May)	16:4 -27	Isaiah 49:10
	16:28-36	Isaiah 58:13
	17:1 -16	Judges 5:14
	18:1 -27	I Kings 17:24;Isaiah 6:1-13;33:13
Sivan (June)	19:1 -25	Isaiah 61:6-10;Ezekiel 1:1
	20:1 -26	Ezekiel 1:1-28
	21:1 -22:23	Isaiah 56:1;Jeremiah 34:1;34:8
	22:24-23:19	Isaiah 59:1-3
	23:20-24:18	
	25:1 -40	I Kings 5:26;6:11-13; Isaiah 60:17-61:9
	26:1 -30	I Kings 6:11-13;Isaiah 66:1-11
Tammuz (July)	26:31-27:19	I Kings 5:1-18
	27:20-28:43	Jeremiah 11:1-23;Ezekiel 43:10;Hosea 14:7
	29:1 -46	Isaiah 61:6
Ab (August)	30:1 -11	Malachi 1:2-2:7
	30:12-38	I Kings 28:1,20;II Kings 12:5
	31:1 -32:14	Isaiah 43:7-21
	32:15-33:11	II Samuel 22:10-15
	33:12-34:26	Ezekiel 36:27;38:18
Elul (September)	34:1 -26	I Kings 18:27-39
	34:27-35	Jeremiah 31:33-40
	35:1 -29	I Kings 7:13,40
	35:30-36:38	
	37:1 -29	I Kings 8:8-22
	38:1 -20	I Kings 7:40
	38:21-39:32	I Kings 7:27,51;Jeremiah 30:18-31:9
	39:33-40:38	I Kings 7:13,50;Isaiah 33:20-34:8
Leviticus	1:1 - 2:16	Isaiah 43:21; Jeremiah 31:9;Ezekiel 20:41
	3:1 -17	Ezekiel 44:11
Tisri (October)		
New Year	4:1 -35	Jeremiah 31:19;Ezekiel 18:4-17
Atonement	5:1 -19	Micah 6:9-7:8;Zechariah 5:3-6:14
Tabernacles	6:1 -11	Jeremiah 7:21
	6:12- 7:38	Malachi 3:4-12
	8:1 -36	Ezekiel 43:27;44:17
	9:1 -10:8	II Samuel 6:6;I Kings 8:56-58
	10:9 -20	

The Sabbaths	The Law	The Prophets
	11:1 -47	
	12:1 -13:28	II Kings 4:42;Isaiah 66:7
Cheshvan (November)	13:29-59	II Kings 5:1-27
	14:1 -32	II Kings 7:3
	15:1 -24	
	15:25-33	
	16:1 -34	Isaiah 57:14;Ezekiel 22:1;44:27
Kisleu (December)	17:1 -16	
	18:1 -30	Ezekiel 16:1-63;Amos 9:7; Jonah 1:1
	19:1 -22	Isaiah 4:3;5:16;Ezekiel 22:2
	19:23-37	
	20:1 -27	Ezekiel 16:1-63
Tebeth (January)	22:18-25	
	22:26-23:44	I Kings 8:2;II Kings 23:1;Zechariah 14:1
	23:1 -8	Jeremiah 31:19
	23:9 -44	
Dedication	24:1 -23	Zephaniah 1:12;Zechariah 4:2
	25:1 -13	Jeremiah 32:6;36:6
	25:14-38	
	25:39-26:2	Isaiah 24:2
Shebat (February)	26:3 -46	Isaiah 1:19;Jeremiah 16:19;Ezekiel 12:20
	27:1 -34	
Numbers	1:1 -54	Hosea 2:1
	2:1 -34	
	3:1 -13	
	3:14-4:16	Isaiah 43:9
Adar (March)	4:17- 5:10	I Samuel 16:10,14
	5:11-31	Hosea 4:14
	6:1 -21	Judges 13:2
Nisan (April)	6:22- 7:47	
	8:1 -26	Zechariah 2:10;4:14
Passover	9:1 -23	Joshua 3:1-17;5:19,20
	10:1 -10	
	10:11-36	
	11:1 -15	
	11:16-22	Isaiah 45:9
	11:23-35	
Iyyar (May)	12:1 -16	
	13:1 -33	Joshua 2:1;Judges 18:7
	14:1 -10	
	14:11-45	Isaiah 45:9
	15:1 -41	
	16:1 -24	I Samuel 9:14;Hosea 10:2

The Sabbaths	The Law	The Prophets
	16:24-17:1	Isaiah 6:1
Sivan (June)	17:2 -18:25	Ezekiel 44:15
	18:26-32	Ezekiel 44:21,29
	19:1 -20:13	Judges 11:1
	20:14-29	Judges 11:1
	21:1 -22:1	
	22:2 -25	Micah 5:6
	22:26-23:1	
Tammuz (July)	23:2 -9	
	23:10-24:25	Isaiah 50:4-6;51:1
	25:1 -9	Joel 3:18-21;Amos 1:1-5; 3:7
	25:10-26:51	I Kings 18:46;19:1-21; Malachi 2:5
	26:52-27:15	Joshua 17:4
	27:16-28:8	
	28:9 -25	I Samuel 29:18;Isaiah 66:1;Ezekiel 45:12
	28:26-28:16	
	29:17-40	Ezekiel 38:18
Ab (August)	30:1 -16	Jeremiah 1:1;4:2
	31:1 -24	
	31:25-54	
	32:1 -42	Joshua 22:2;Jeremiah 2:1-37
	33:1 -56	Jeremiah 2:4
	34:1 -35:9	Joshua 21:41;Ezekiel 45:1
	35:10-34	Joshua 20:1-21:3
	36:1 -13	Judges 21:1-25
Elul (September)		
Deuteronomy	1:1 - 2:2	Isaiah 1:19;Jeremiah 30:4;Amos 2:9;Zechariah 8:16
	2:3 -30	Isaiah 1:1-27
	2:31- 3:22	Amos 2:9
	3:23-29	II Kings 8:30;Isaiah 40:1-26;Jeremiah 32:16
	4:1 -24	
	4:25-40	Jeremiah 8:13
	4:41-49	
Tisri (October)		
New Year	5:1 - 6:3	Joel 2:1
Atonement	6:4 - 7:11	I Kings 13:23;18:39
	7:12-26	Isaiah 49:14-51:4
Tabernacles	8:1 -20	Isaiah 4:6;Jeremiah 9:22-24
	9:1 -29	II Kings 8:30;Jeremiah 2:1;21:8

The Sabbaths	The Law	The Prophets
Cheshvan (November)	10:1 -11:9	II Kings 13:23
	11:10-25	
	11:26-12:19	Isaiah 54:11;Jeremiah 21:8
	12:20-13:1	Jeremiah 23:9
	13:2 -18	
	14:1 -21	
	14:22-15:6	Isaiah 10:32
	15:7 -18	Isaiah 56:1-2
	15:19-16:17	I Kings 8:54;Isaiah 10:32;Habakkuk 2:20
Kisleu (December)	16:18-17:13	Isaiah 51:12
	17:14-20	I Samuel 8:1;10:24
	18:1 -12	II Kings 29:8;Jeremiah 29:8
	18:13-20:9	
	20:10-21:9	Joshua 24:1;I Samuel 17:37
Tebeth (January)	21:10-22:5	
	22:6 -23:9	
Dedication	23:10-24:18	
	24:19-26:1	
	26:2 -27:26	Joshua 8:30
	28:1 -14	Isaiah 1:1-31;Jeremiah 51:1-19
	28:15-29:9	Jeremiah 8:13
Shebat (February)	29:10-30:10	Joshua 24:1;Isaiah 55:6;58:8;61:10;Hosea 14:2-10;Micah 7:18-20
	30:11-20	Jeremiah 12:15;Hosea 14:2
	31:1-13	
Adar (March)	31:14-30	Judges 2:7
	32:1 -52	II Samuel 22:1-52;Ezekiel 17:22;Hosea 14:2-10
	33:1 -29	Joshua 1:1
	34:1 -12	

APPENDIX B

THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF ACTS 17

THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF ACTS 17

The text of the dissertation has viewed the historical setting of Paul's Athenian sermon as an evangelistic message preached to a miscellaneous and inquisitive crowd gathered on the hill of the Areopagus. Others have a different understanding of the context of this address, believing instead that Paul is making some sort of defense before an Athenian Council.

Many interpret the reference to Paul's being led "to the Areopagus" in Acts 17:19, to mean that he was brought "before the Council of the Areopagus." They argue that it is not a well-known geographical location which Luke has in mind, but rather a powerful Athenian tribunal. They point out, first, that "the Areopagus" was frequently used as a shortened name for "the Council of the Areopagus."[1]

---

[1] Aristotle The Art of Rhetoric, 1. 1. 5, and Lysias Before the Areopagus: Defense in the Matter of the Olive Stumps, 22. Cf. F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts; the English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes, in the New International Commentary on the New Testament, ed. by Ned B. Stonehouse (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), p. 352, n. 23; and W. M. Ramsay, The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915), pp. 102-105, and St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen (3rd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949), pp. 260-61.

Second, they reason that the words, "Paul, standing in the midst of the Areopagus" (Acts 17:22), make better sense when interpreted with respect to persons than with respect to place:

> The most specific confirmation of this view is found, in my judgment, in the manner in which references to the Areopagus are introduced. Paul is said to have stood "in the midst of the Areopagus" (verse 22), and following the conclusion of his address to have gone out "from their midst" (verse 33). The prepositional phrase "in the midst of" may be used with reference to places as well as persons: Lk. 21:28 (*sic*--the reference should be to Luke 21:21) refers to those who are in the midst of Judea; Mk. 6:47 to the boat of the disciples as being in the midst of the sea. But it is exceedingly doubtful that a person or group of persons would be described as being in the midst of a hill. On the other hand, Luke repeatedly speaks of persons as being in the midst of other persons (Acts 1:15, 2:22, 4:7, 27:21; Lk. 2:46, 22:27, 55, 24:36). And the utmost continuity is preserved on this view since Paul is said to have gone forth from *their* midst.[2]

And finally, they argue that the Greek phrasing of verse 19 (especially the words ἐπιλαμβάνομαι and ἐπί) seems to suggest that Paul was forcibly seized and brought before an Athenian court of justice:

> Luke often uses ἐπιλαμβάνομαι in the sense "to take," "to lay hold of." In Luke 23:26, for example, we read of the soldiers laying hold of Simon of Cyrene to make him help Jesus bear the cross, and similarly in Acts 18:17, "all the Greeks took Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, and beat him before the judgment

---

[2] N. B. Stonehouse, "The Areopagus Address," in *Paul Before the Areopagus and Other New Testament Studies* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957, p. 9; [italics his.] Cf. Bertil Gartner, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation*, trans. by Carolyn Hannay King, Vol. 21 of *Acts Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, ed. by Anton Fridrichsen and Harald Riesenfeld (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1955), pp. 55-56; and W. M. Ramsay, "St. Paul in Athens--I, *The Expositor*, 5th Series, 2 (1895), 214-15.

> seat"; in 21:30 the Jews seized Paul, and drew him out of the temple; and in v. 33 the chief captain took him and commanded he should be bound with chains. Cf. 17:6: "They drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city. The Vulgate evidently accepts the idea of a "laying hold of," for έπιγαμβάνομαι is translated by apprehendere.

Along with this view--that Paul was led to a group of men rather than to a geographical hill--are several explanations as to why the Apostle would have been thus brought before the Council of the Areopagus. Some suggest that he was made to stand trial on the charge of introducing a new religion. Reference is usually made to the trial and death of Socrates who was accused, like Paul, of "bringing in strange deities."[3] Lewis is an able representative of those who hold this view:

> No people ever showed more courtesy to the forms of worship practised by other nations than the Athenians. They were even solicitous to enroll as their own, every god that was adored on the face of the earth, but at the same time it was death for any private person to disturb the religion of the State by the introduction of any foreign god that had not been publicly recognised. Such had been the law in the time of Socrates, and such it was still; for the Romans, when they became masters of the city, allowed the descendants of so illustrious an ancestry to retain their laws and continue their courts of judicature.
>
> The Areopagus, which still retained its ancient authority, or had even extended it, had exclusive jurisdiction of determining what objects of worship should be admitted, and of inflicting punishment when persons made any wanton inroad upon the national creed. Paul, therefore, by propagating the doctrine of one God, and a resurrection from the dead, and that Jesus would be the Judge of all men, had furnished a handle to the disputants, whom he had offended, to bring his life

---

[3] Xenophon Memorabilia 1. 1. 1. Cf. Diogenes Laertius Lives of Eminent Philosophers 2. 40; Plato Euthyphro 3B, The Apology 24B; and Josephus Against Apion 2. 262-68.

> into jeopardy. They might urge with great plausibility that if the gods whom Paul preached were really such, they ought to be recognized by the State; but if they were not gods, the impostor who was obtruding them as such should be punished, and in either case, the matter ought to be brought before the Areopagus.[4]

Curtius suggests a second view--that the Areopagus was the chief police commission in first-century Athens, and that Paul was brought before a subdivision whose responsibility it was to keep order in the *agora*:

> At that time the Areopagus was entrusted with various powers to provide for order and good behavior in a city which was always in a state of agitation. It was the supreme police authority, as we can infer from its powers in the matter of buildings and statues, and it is very probable that a committee of the Areopagus, sitting in the market hall, was also entrusted with a superintendence over the market traffic in order to take steps against unlawful and turbulent movements.[5]

A third and final view is that "Paul was compelled to face the council to demonstrate that his appearance among the public lecturers of Athens was unobjectionable."[6] Sir William Ramsay is the leading exponent of this interpretation:

---

[4] Thomas Lewin, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (2 vols.; London: George Bell and Sons, 1874), I, p. 260-61. A similar approach can be found in Timothy D. Barnes, "An Apostle on Trial," *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, 20 (October, 1969), pp. 407-19; Charles W. Carter and Ralph Earle, *The Acts of the Apostles*, in *The Evangelical Commentary*, ed. by George Allen Turner (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959), pp. 256-57; David Smith, *The Life and Letters of St. Paul* (New York: Harper & Brothers, n.d.), p. 144; Maurice Jones, *St. Paul the Orator; a Critical, Historical, and Explanatory Commentary on the Speeches of St. Paul* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910), pp. 89-90; and Richard Belward Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles, an Exposition*, in *Westminster Commentaries*, Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1951), pp. 310-11.

[5] Ernst Curtius, "St. Paul in Athens," trans. by A. E. N. Simms, *The Expositor*, 7th Series, 4 (November, 1907), 438. Lake and Cadbury also think it possible that Paul was brought before the Areopagus "on the general ground that he was creating a disturbance" (Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, *English Translation and Commentary*, Vol. IV of *The Beginnings of Christianity; Part I: The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (5 vols.; London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1920-1933), p. 213.

> Two questions have to be answered in regard to the scene that follows: why was Paul taken before the Council? and what were the intentions of the philosophers in taking him there? It is clear that Paul appeared to the philosophers as one of the many ambitious teachers who came to Athens hoping to find fame and fortune at the great centre of education. Now, certain powers were vested in the Council of Areopagus to appoint or invite lecturers at Athens, and to exercise some general control over the lecturers in the interests of public order and morality. There is an almost complete lack of evidence what were the advantages and the legal rights of a lecturer thus appointed, and to what extent or in what way a strange teacher could find freedom to lecture in Athens. There existed something in the way of privileges vested in the recognised lecturers; for the fact that Cicero induced the Areopagus to pass a decree inviting Cratippus, the Peripatetic philosopher, to become a lecturer in Athens, implies that some advantage was thereby secured to him. There certainly also existed much freedom for foreigners to become lecturers in Athens, for the great majority of the Athenian professors and lecturers were foreign. The scene described in vv. 18-34 seems to prove that the recognised lecturers could take a strange lecturer before the Areopagus, and require him to give an account of his teaching and pass a test as to its character.
>
> When they took him to the court to satisfy the supreme university tribunal of his qualifications, they probably entertained some hope that he would be overawed before that august body, or that his teaching might not pass muster, as being of unsettling tendency (for nobody is so conservative as a University Court).[7]

---

[6] Stonehouse, "The Areopagus Address," p. 9. Cf. F. F. Bruce, The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles, Tyndale Monographs (London: The Tyndale Press, 1942), p. 16.

[7] Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, pp. 246-47. Cf. also his Bearing of Recent Discovery, pp. 97-98; The Cities of St. Paul: Their Influence on His

While these three views differ as to why Paul was brought before the Council--whether for a heresy trial, or on a charge of creating a disturbance, or for an inquiry into his qualifications as a teacher--they all do agree that the words "the Areopagus" refer to a judicial court and not to a geographical hill. Proponents of these views usually go on to suggest that the actual delivery of the sermon took place in the Stoa Basileios, a large hall in the *agora* where the Council usually conducted its business.[8] Ramsay most strenuously rejects the hilltop as a satisfactory spot for the address, arguing: (1) "The top of the little hill is a most unsuitable place from its small size and its exposed position"; (2) "It is inconsistent with the patriotism and pride of the Athenians that they should conduct a foreigner for whom they expressed such contempt to the most impressive seat of Athenian religious and natural history, in order that he might there talk to them"; and (3) "The scene and

---

Life and Thought (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1907), pp. 229-30; and "St. Paul in Athens--II," *The Expositor*, 5th Series, 2 (1895), 263-72. Gartner suggests that this "informal interrogation" was not done by the Council as a whole, but by its "education commission" (*The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation*, pp. 57-65).

[8] "The Speech was delivered probably in the Stoa Basileios in the Athenian Agora," (Bruce, *The Speeches in Acts*, p. 16). "The seat of the council in the first century was before the Stoa Basileios" (Lake and Cadbury, *English Translation and Commentary*, Vol. IV of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 212). Cf. Henry J. Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1955), pp. 51-52; J. M. Mecklin, "Paul in Athens," *The Bible Student*, 7 (February, 1903), 82; and Stonehouse, "The Areopagus Address," p. 8.

the speech breathe the spirit of the agora, and the open, free, crowded life of Athens, not the quiet atmosphere of the philosophic study or class room."[9] A few, however, still locate the address on the famous Athenian plateau, believing that Paul is speaking to the Council of the Areopagus in session on the Areopagus hill.[10]

In summary, the alternate interpretation of the historical setting of Acts 17 is that Paul was taken to another part of the agora and there put before the Council of the Areopagus for some judicial purpose.

There are many reasons why this interpretation has not been followed in the dissertation. A close examination of all the factors, leads, instead, to the viewpoint adopted in the text--that the sermon was given on a famous hill to a miscellaneous crowd of philosophers and citizens. The place to begin, is with those considerations which point to the hill rather than the agora as the correct location of Paul's address.

First, even if the sermon were given to the Council, it would have been given on the hill where the Council regularly assembled, and not in the agora. The belief that the Council met in the Stoa Basileios rests on very disputed evidence. There is far more evidence that just the opposite is true--that the Council held its sessions on the hill itself.[11]

---

[9] Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, p. 244. Cf. also his "St. Paul in Athens--I," pp. 211-15.

[10] Barnes, "Apostle on Trial," pp. 407-10; Lewin, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, I, pp. 261-62; and Smith, Life and Letters of St. Paul, p. 145.

Moreover, contrary to Ramsay, the hill did have sufficient room for a large gathering. Ramsay himself admits that the plateau could accommodate nearly a hundred people.[12] Manatt goes even further in insisting that

> there was no lack of room; our own eyes witness that. On the highest platform facing the Acropolis there is comparatively level standing-ground for at least five hundred people,--the court in historical times could hardly have numbered more than ninety members,--and the gradually descending steps to the west afford ample room for thousands more.[13]

And finally, it is merely a subjective opinion to feel that such a thing would be "inconsistent with the patriotism and pride of the Athenians." Others believe just as strongly that the Areopagus was a suitable place for the spirit of the occasion. They argue that the religious associations surrounding the hill made it an appropriate spot to listen to some new teaching about foreign divinities.[14] Even so, it is not necessary to believe that Paul was conducted to the tribunal area on the hill's plateau. There are other spacious spots on the Areopagus to which he might have been taken. Mathews follows a tradition of the Greek Church, saying that Paul gave his sermon on a slope just below the plateau to the northwest. He describes it as the nearest point on the hill to the *agora*, acoustically ideal, and sheltered from the sun.[15] Dibelius prefers a ridge southeast of the plateau.[16]

---

[11] Barnes, "Apostle on Trial," pp. 408-10; Irving J. Manatt, "Biblical and Historical Criticism: Must We Give up the Pauline Areopagus?" The Andover Review, 18 (November, 1892), 528-30. Pausanias' description of the Areopagus likewise implies that the Council was still meeting on the hill in his day, a century after Paul (Description of Greece, 1. 28. 5).

[12] Ramsay, "St. Paul in Athens--I," p. 212.

[13] Manatt, "Must We Give Up the Pauline Areopagus?" p. 538.

Thus, whatever the purpose of Paul's sermon--whether a defense of some sort to a Council, or an evangelistic thrust before a miscellaneous audience--it is almost certain that it took place somewhere on the Athenian hill known as the Areopagus.

The question remains then, what was the purpose of Paul's sermon? Was it a defense before a council, or was it an attempt to win the general Athenian populace to Christ?

While it is true that there was at least one member of the Council among Paul's listeners,[17] there are several reasons for concluding that Paul's address was a missionary sermon to a mixed audience, and not a forced appearance before a Council. These reasons center around: (1) the lack of judicial proceedings; (2) the tenuous evidence of the individual proposals; (3) the exegesis of certain Greek phrases; (4) the intent of the author in Acts 17:21; and (5) the content of the sermon itself.

---

[14] Manatt claims that the hill was the *only* fit rendezvous from the Athenian standpoint (Ibid., pp. 538-39). Cf. also above, p. 128, n. 1.

[15] Basil Mathews, "Contributions and Comments: Where Did Paul Speak at Athens?" *The Expository Times*, 26 (March, 1915), 281-83.

[16] Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. by Heinrich Greeven, trans. by Mary Line (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1956), pp. 68, 80-81.

[17] Dionysius, the Areopagite, is mentioned as one who believed as a result of this sermon (Acts 17:34).

First, there is nothing in the entire episode to indicate judicial proceedings--no accusation, no cross-examination, no discussion, no sentence, no hint of a trial of any kind. Barnes tries to get around the force of this objection by arguing that it presupposes

> an anachronistic notion of what constitutes a criminal trial. The most uniform practice of the Roman world was an informal process, with hardly any rules to circumscribe either procedure or penalties or the nature of the charge.[18]

But Conzelmann's rebuttal is decisive: "The literary style of Luke rules that out: whenever he reports a trial he is absolutely unambiguous."[19] Even Barnes himself is forced to admit that "the author evidently does not intend his readers to understand the outcome of Paul's speech as an acquittal after trial."[20]

---

[18] Barnes, "Apostle on Trial," pp. 413-14.

[19] Hans Conzelmann, "The Address of Paul on the Areopagus," in Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. by Leander E. Keck and S. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 219.

[20] Barnes, "Apostle on Trial," p. 418.

Second, not only does the whole scene lack any overtones of a tribunal, but each individual proposal as to the nature of the inquest--a heresy trial, a charge of creating a disturbance, or an educational inquiry--rests on tenuous grounds. For instance, while it may be true that the Council of the Areopagus was the chief governing body of Athens,[21] it is not clear that it therefore had jurisdiction over heresy trials. Aristotle seems to suggest otherwise: after writing that "charges of impiety" were tried in the court of the King, he goes on to add: "Trials for deliberate murder and wounding are held in the Areopagus, and for causing death by poison, and for arson: for these only are tried by the Council."[22] Manatt further substantiates this lack of jurisdiction by examining the famous heresy trials of antiquity. He concludes that "it was not the Areopagus, but the heliasts, who would exercise regular jurisdiction in cases of impiety."[23]

The other two proposals are equally vulnerable. There is no evidence of an uproar or a disturbance in the narrative to substantiate a charge of disorder. And if such a charge was being made, it is difficult to imagine a speech further from the point than Paul's sermon. As to the suggestion of an educational inquiry, Ramsay himself concedes that "there is an almost complete lack of evidence what were the advantages and the legal rights of a lecturer thus appointed, and to what extent or in what way a strange teacher could find freedom to lecture in Athens."[24]

---

[21] Ibid., pp. 411-14.

[22] Aristotle, The Athenian Constitution, 57. 2-3. Underlining mine.

[23] Manatt, "Must We Give Up the Pauline Areopagus?" pp. 530-34. Ramsay concurs: "Accusations of impiety and of the introduction of foreign and unlawful religion were tried before the popular courts, and never before the Areopagus" ("St. Paul in Athens--II," p. 271). Cf. Lake and Cadbury: "Socrates was, of course, really tried before the court of the 'King Archon' before a special jury probably numbering 501," (English Translation and Commentary, Vol. IV of The Beginnings of Christianity, p. 212).

Third, there is no reason exegetically to conclude from certain Greek phrases that Paul was forcefully dragged before a Council. The statement, "They took hold of him and brought him to the Areopagus" (Acts 17:19), does not have to be interpreted hostilely on the basis of ἐπιλαμβάνομαι. Several times Luke uses this verb to express a friendly action. In each use of the verb in the New Testament "it can be determined by the context whether it is used in a favorable or an unfavorable sense."[25] And there is nothing in this context to indicate any animosity or any desire to forcefully arraign Paul. The action in taking hold of him is nothing "more than a friendly guidance of him to a more convenient place of discussion."[25]

---

[24] Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, pp. 246-47. He makes similar admissions in "St. Paul in Athens--II," p. 265, declaring that the key questions are "involved in the utmost obscurity," and that "we cannot answer these questions with any approach to accuracy." His one example from Cicero is not conclusive, for, as Barnes points out:

> "When Cicero persuaded the Areopagus to ask the philosopher Cratippus to stay to teach in Athens, the reason was not that the Areopagus had any special control over the lectures of philosophers, but that Cicero considered an invitation from the Areopagus the most likely to influence Cratippus" (Barnes, "Apostle on Trial," p. 413.

Similarly, it is not necessary to argue that the clause, "Paul standing in the midst of the Areopagus" (Acts 17:22), makes better sense interpreted with respect to persons than with respect to place. Twice in Luke (Luke 21:21; 22:55) and several other times in the New Testament (Matthew 14:24; Mark 6:47; Revelations 4:6; 5:6; 7:17; 22:2) the prepositional phrase "in the midst of" is used with reference to a place. The same sense can be easily accepted here --that Paul was standing on the summit of a hill as he gave his sermon.

A fourth and very persuasive reason for rejecting the view that this is a defense before a Council is Luke's own explanation in verse 21 for the Athenian behavior. He attributes their request for additional discourse solely to their passion for "telling or hearing something new." The whole proceeding, Luke intends to say, evolved not out of some violated law or required examination, but out of the notorious and incessant curiosity of the Athenians.

---

[25] R. J. Knowling, "The Acts of the Apostles," in The Acts of the Apostles; St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans; St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, Vol. II of The Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. by W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961), p. 368.

[26] Lewin, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, I, p. 262.

Finally, the content of the sermon itself effectively militates against this alternate interpretation. Paul's address is not a "defense" of any sort. Rather, it is a bold attempt to win the Athenians away from idolatry and to the living God. Paul had been aroused out of his intended rest when he saw that the city was a veritable forest of idols. He began to preach Jesus and the resurrection. The ever-inquisitive Athenians, hearing only bits and snatches in the crowded agora, led him to the seclusion of a nearby hill. There on the Areopagus, the Apostle attempted to turn the Athenians from the worship of these idols to the worship of the true God. The very content of his sermon is evangelistic, not apologetic.

When all of these factors are carefully weighed, it seems best to conclude that the sermon of Acts 17 was preached on an Athenian hill to a mixed and curious audience in hopes of leading them out of idolatry.

APPENDIX C

THE UNKNOWN GOD

THE UNKNOWN GOD

Much has been written about the altar of Acts 17:23 and about its inscription "to the Unknown God." The discussion has centered around two questions: (1) What is the evidence for the existence of such an inscription? and (2) Why would such an altar be erected?

Many strands of evidence point to the existence of such an inscription. Pausanias says that on the way from Phalerum to Athens there were "altars of the gods" named "unknown," and that at Olympia, in the immediate vicinity of the great altar of Zeus, there were other altars, including "an altar of Unknown Gods."[1] Philostratus counsels that it is a "proof of wisdom and sobriety to speak well of all the gods, especially at Athens, where altars are set up in honor even of unknown gods."[2] And the reconstructed inscription on an altar found in the sacred precincts of a temple in Pergamum reads, "To unknown gods."[3]

---

[1] Pausanias, Description of Greece, 1. 1. 4; 5. 14. 8.

[2] Philostratus, Life of Apolonius of Tyana, 6. 3.

[3] Adolf Deissman, Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. by William E. Wilson (2nd ed., rev. and enlarged; New York: George H. Doran Company, 1926), pp. 287-91.

The fact that the plural appears in all of these instances has caused some difficulty. Kirsopp Lake expresses the attitude of many when he says, "It is doubtful whether there ever was an inscription which read exactly ἀγνώστω θεῶ."[4] Jerome goes so far as to say that the inscription Paul saw was in the plural, but that the Apostle stated it in the singular for the sake of his argument.[5]

There are several reasons, however, for rejecting the idea that a singular inscription never existed. First, the very fact that Paul cites the inscription in the singular is sufficient evidence for its existence. It would have been extremely foolish for him to try to "put one over" on his audience by changing an inscription that they were all familiar with. Such an attempt would have left him thoroughly discredited in the eyes of the Athenians. Moreover, in the larger scope, "Luke's whole apologetic purpose would be thwarted if his educated non-Christian readers should at any point in the speech have cause to suspect that Paul was arguing from an assumption which the Athenians did not accept."[6] The sermon could not have been effective, either with the immediate audience or with the subsequent readers, unless Paul was historically correct in his statement.

---

[4] Kirsopp Lake, "The Unknown God," in Additional Notes to the Commentary, ed. by Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, Vol. V of The Beginnings of Christianity; Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, ed. by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (5 vols.; London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1920-1933), p. 245.

[5] Jerome Comment, in Titum 1. 12, cited in English by Giuseppe Ricciotti, The Acts of the Apostles; Text and Commentary, trans. by Laurence E. Byrne (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1958), pp. 273-74, and in Latin by Lake, "The Unknown God," pp. 242-43.

Second, the language of Pausanias and Philostratus is sufficiently general to comprehend an altar with the singular form of the inscription. If there were two or more altars, each bearing an inscription, "To the Unknown God," these would well be referred to collectively as "altars to unknown gods."

Third, there is evidence in other places of dedicatory inscriptions to a single deity who for some reason or other had not been identified. Ricciotti mentions one such altar on the Palatine hill in Rome, inscribed to an unknown god or goddess.[7]

Finally, there is Athenian support for a singular inscription from the well-known story by Diogenes Laertius concerning Epimenides the Cretan, who, when summoned during a plague around 600 B.C., advised that white and black sheep should be driven from the Areopagus and that where they came to rest the Athenians should sacrifice "to the appropriate god." As a result, the plague was stayed and Diogenes reports that even in his day (in the third century A.D.),

---

[6] J. C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), p. 13.

[7] Ricciotti, Acts of the Apostles, p. 274.

"anonymous altars" could be found in the vicinity of Athens.[8] Though the account is silent concerning any inscriptions on these anonymous altars, it at least points to a particular occasion when more than one altar was erected to a single, unknown god.[9]

Thus, the fact that the archaeologist has not yet dug up the exact singular inscription "To the Unknown God" is no proof that such an inscription never existed. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that Athenians knew the inscription well and that Paul quoted it accurately.

The answer to the second question--Why would such an altar be erected?--is a bit conjectural. It may be that the altar was dedicated at the time of some special emergency, such as at the plague described by Diogenes Laertius, when the Athenians did not know which god was responsible.

Another story along this line comes from Herodotus, who tells of an Athenian runner sent to Sparta before the Battle of Marathon. On the way the runner met Pan who lamented, "Why is it that ye take no thought for me, that am your friend, and ere now have oft been serviceable to you, and will be so again?" Whereupon, Herodotus records, the Athenians founded a temple to Pan beneath the Acropolis.[10] To this, the ninth century Isho'dad adds that when the Athenians erected the well-known altar to Pan, they also erected one more altar and dedicated it to the Unknown God lest they unknowingly neglect another deity:

---

[8] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 1. 110. Cf. Aristotle, *The Athenian Constitution*, 1. 1.

[9] Lake thinks that there was an inscription on these altars and that Paul's citation is a paraphrase of it: "The story of Diogenes Laertius suggests that the singular may have been used in the formula τῶ προσήκοντι θεῶ meaning 'to the unknown god who is concerned in the matter'; ἄγνώστω θεῶ would be a loose but not very inaccurate paraphrase." ("The Unknown God," p. 242).

> The Athenians were once upon a time at war with their enemies, and the Athenians retreated from them in defeat; then a certain Demon appeared and said unto them, I have never been honoured by you as I ought; and because I am angry with you, therefore you have had a defeat from your enemies. Then the Athenians were afraid and raised to him the well-known altar; and because they dreaded lest this very thing should happen to them, having secretly neglected (one) who was unknown to them, they erected for themselves one altar more, and wrote upon it, Of the Unknown and Hidden God; and when they wished to say this, that though there is a God in whom we do not believe, we raise this altar to His honour, that He may be reconciled to us, although He is not honoured as known; therefore Paul did well to take a reason from this, and said before them, "This hidden God to whom ye have raised an altar without knowing him, I have come to declare unto you."[11]

Hackett, in a similar vein, locates the origin of the altar in the Athenian desire to embrace as many gods as possible, or at any event to safeguard themselves against forgetfulness of any in the long ranks of the deities.

Some understand the altar more specifically as a testimony to the existence of the one true God. Carter and Earle, for instance, view it in terms of the High-God

---

[10] Herodotus, History, 6. 105.

[11] Isho'dad of Merv, Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, ed. and trans. by Margaret Dunlop Gibson, Horae Semiticae, 10 (1913), 28, quoted by Lake, "The Unknown God," p. 244.

Theory, which maintains that "all people, including the most primitive, have a concept of a Supreme Being, above and beyond their polytheistic concepts."[12] Lewin goes so far as to suggest that "there is a reasonable probability that by 'the Unknown God' was actually meant Jehovah":

> Since the conquest of Alexander the Great, an intimacy had subsisted between the Jews and the Greeks, and in particular, the Athenians had entered into a treaty with that singular people, and had greatly honoured Hyranus, the High Priest; and it is scarcely credible that the Athenians, who adopted the gods of all foreigners, should have excluded Jehovah, whose mighty acts could not but be familiar to the neighbouring nations. Had Jehovah, like the false gods, been worshipped as an idol, the Athenians would have erected to him a statue and a temple; but the Jews religiously abstained from uttering any name, and adored him only as a Spiritual Being. Dion Cassius speaks of the God of the Jews as "not to be expressed"; and the Emperor Caligula, in his answer to the Jews, calls him, "him that may not be named by you"; and Lucan and Trebellius Pollio call him "incertus Deus"; and Justin Martyr relates that among the heathen, the God of the Jews was commonly called, "all-hidden." No wonder, then, that the Athenians should inscribe an altar to him as "The Unknown God."[13]

Exactly how and why the altar came to be erected may never be known. But whatever the explanation of its origin, the fact of its existence indicated an awareness of the inadequacy of Athenian religion. It was an expression of their anxious, scrupulous ignorance, and it provided Paul with a starting point for his proclamation of the living God.

---

[13] Thomas Lewin, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul (2 vols.; London: George Bell and Sons, 1874), I, pp. 263-64. Cf. Bertil Gartner, The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation, trans. by Carolyn Hannay King, Vol. 21 of Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, ed. by Anton Fridrichsen and Harald Riesenfeld (Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells, 1955), pp. 246-47.

APPENDIX D

FIGURES OF SPEECH IN HOSEA

FIGURES OF SPEECH IN HOSEA

Figures relating to Idolatry:

". . . for the land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord." 1:2

". . . as they that strive with the priest." 4:4

"They eat up the sin of my people." 4:8

"Ephraim is joined to his idols: let him alone." 4:17

". . . ye have been a snare." 5:1

". . . a net spread upon Tabor." 5:1

". . . Ephraim hath hired lovers." 8:9

". . . as the bread of mourners." 9:4

". . . the prophet is a fool, the spiritual man is mad." 9:7

". . . they set their heart on their iniquity." 4:8

"Ephraim . . . willingly walked." 5:11

"Their drink is sour." 4:18

Figures relating to Nature

". . . as the sand of the sea:" 1:10

". . . make her as a wilderness." 2:3

". . . set her like a dry land." 2:3

". . . the valley of Achor for a door of hope." 2:15

". . . as in the days of her youth." 2:15

". . . I will hear the heavens." 2:21

". . . and they shall hear the earth:" 2:21

"And the earth shall hear the corn, and the wine, and the oil." 2:22

". . . as a backsliding heifer." 4:16

". . . as a lamb in a large place." 4:16

"The wind hath bound her up in her wings." 4:19

". . . like them that remove the bound." 5:10

". . . I will pour out my wrath upon them like water." 5:10

". . . a wild ass alone by himself." 8:9

". . . the prophet is a snare of a fowler." 9:8

"I found Israel like grapes in the wilderness." 9:10

"I saw your fathers as the firstrips in the fig tree." 9:10

". . . their glory shall fly away like a bird." 9:11

"Ephraim . . . is planted in a pleasant place." 9:13

". . . their root is dried up, they shall bear no fruit." 9:6

"Israel is an empty vine." 10:1

"Judgment springeth up as hemlock in the furrows." 10:4

". . . her king is cut off as the foam upon the water." 10:7

". . . they shall bind themselves in their two furrows." 10:10

"And Ephraim is as an heifer that is taught." 10:11

". . . I will make Ephraim to ride." 10:11

". . . Judah shall plow." 10:11

". . . Jacob shall break his clods." 10:11

"Sow to yourselves in righteousness, reap in mercy." 10:12

"Break up your fallow ground." 10:12

". . . seek the Lord, till He come and rain righteousness upon you." 10:12

"Ye have plowed wickedness, ye have reaped iniquity." 10:13

". . . and shall consume his branches, and devour them." 11:6

". . . He shall roar like a lion." 11:10

"They shall tremble as a bird out of Egypt." 11:11

". . . as a dove out of the land of Assyria." 11:11

"Ephraim feedeth on wind." 12:1

". . . and followeth after the east wind." 12:1

". . . their altars are as heaps in the furrows of the fields." 12:11

"Therefore they shall be as the morning cloud." 13:3

". . . as the early dew that passeth away." 13:3

". . . as the chaff that is driven with the whirlwind." 13:3

"According to their pasture, so were they filled." 13:6

"Therefore I will be unto them as a lion." 13:7

". . . as a leopard by the way will I observe them." 13:7

"I will meet them as a bear bereaved of her whelps." 13:8

". . . there will I devour them like a lion." 13:8

"I will ransom them from the power of the grave." 13:14

"I will redeem them from death." 13:14

". . . O death, I will be thy plagues." 13:14

". . . O grave, I will be thy destruction." 13:14

". . . the wind of the Lord shall come up from the wilderness." 13:15

". . . his spring shall become dry." 13:15

". . . his fountain shall be dried up." 13:15

"I will be as the dew unto Israel." 14:5

". . . he shall grow as the lily." 14:5

". . . cast forth his roots as Lebanon." 14:5

"His branches shall spread." 14:6

". . . his beauty shall be as the olive tree." 14:6

". . . his smell as Lebanon." 14:6

". . . They that dwell under his shadow shall return." 14:7

". . . they shall revive as the corn." 14:7

". . . and grow as the vine." 14:7

". . . the scent thereof shall be as the wine of Lebanon." 14:7

". . . I am like a green fir tree." 14:8

". . . as a moth." 5:12

". . . as rottenness." 5:12

". . . his going forth is prepared as the morning." 6:3

". . . and He shall come unto us as the rain." 6:3

". . . as the latter and former rain unto the earth." 6:3

". . . your goodness is as a morning cloud." 6:4

". . . as the early dew it goeth away." 6:4

". . . thy judgments are as the light that goeth forth." 6:5

". . . He hath set a harvest for thee." 6:11

"Strangers have devoured his strength." 7:9

". . . gray hairs are here and there upon him." 7:9

"Ephraim also is like a silly dove without heart." 7:11

". . . I will spread My net upon them." 7:12

". . . I will bring them down as the fowls of the heavens." 7:12

"He shall come as an eagle." 8:1

"For they have sown the wind." 8:7

". . . they shall reap the whirlwind." 8:7

". . . I will hedge up thy way with thorns." 2:6

". . . Therefore shall the land mourn." 4:3

Figures used as Warnings:

". . . I will avenge the blood of Jezreel." 1:4

". . . I will break the bow of Israel." 1:5

". . . slay her with thirst." 2:3

". . . make a wall." 2:6

". . . she shall not find her paths." 2:6

". . . none shall deliver her out of Mine hand." 2:10

". . . as rottenness." 5:12

"For I will be unto Ephraim as a lion." 5:14

". . . and as a young lion to the house of Judah." 5:14

". . . I, even I, will tear and go away." 5:14

"Set the trumpet to thy mouth." 8:1

". . . as the bread of mourners." 9:4

"Israel is swallowed up." 8:8

". . . as a vessel wherein is no pleasure." 8:8

"And the sword shall abide on his cities." 11:6

". . . He shall roar like a lion." 11:10

". . . when He shall roar, then the children shall tremble." 11:10

". . . as the smoke out of the chimney." 13:3

"Therefore I will be unto them as a lion." 13:7

". . . as a leopard by the way will I observe them." 13:7

"I will meet them as a bear bereaved of her whelps." 13:8

". . . there will I devour them like a lion." 13:8

"The sorrows of a travailing woman shall come upon him." 13:13

Figures relating to Accusation:

". . . the pride of Israel doth testify to his face." 5:5

"Therefore have I hewed them by the prophets." 6:5

"I have slain them by the words of My mouth." 6:5

"When Ephraim saw his sickness." 5:13

". . . and Judah saw his wound." 5:13

"And as troops of robbers wait for a man." 6:9

". . . Israel is defiled." 6:10

"O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself." 13:9

". . . their own doings have beset them about." 7:2

". . . they are before my face." 7:2

". . . as an oven heated by the baker." 7:4

"For they have made ready their heart like an oven." 7:6

". . . it burneth as a flaming fire." 7:6

"They are all hot as an oven, and have devoured their judges." 7:7

". . . he hath mixed himself among the people." 7:8

". . . Ephraim is a cake not turned." 7:8

"And the pride of Israel testifieth to his face." 7:10

". . . they are like a deceitful bow." 7:16

". . . ye have eaten the fruit of lies." 10:13

"Ephraim compasseth Me about with lies." 11:12

"He is a merchant, the balances of deceit are in his hand." 12:7

Figures of Allusion:

". . . and the Lord is his memorial." 12:5

". . . as in the days of the solemn feast." 12:9

". . . as in the days of her youth." 2:15

". . . as the sand of the sea." 1:10

Figures of God's Fatherhood:

"When Israel was a child, then I loved him." 11:1

"I taught Ephraim to go . . . taking them by their arms." 11:3

"I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love." 11:4

". . . I was to them as they that take off the yoke." 11:4

". . . and I laid meat before them." 11:4

". . . he is an unwise son." 13:13

". . . Mine heart is turned within Me." 11:8

Figures of Promise:

". . . ye are the sons of the living God." 1:10

". . . as the sand of the sea." 1:10

". . . I will break the bow and the sword." 2:18

". . . I will betroth thee unto Me forever." 2:19

". . . and they shall hear Jezreel." 2:22

". . . for He hath torn, and He will heal us." 6:1

". . . He hath smitten and He will bind us up." 6:1

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Aeschylus. Agamemnon. *The Libation-Bearers; Eumenides; Fragments*. Trans. Herbert Weir Smyth. Vol. II of the *Works* of Aeschylus. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. Ed. R. H. Charles, et al. 2 vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.

Aratus. *Phaenomena*. Trans. B. R. Mair. Callimachus. *Hymns and Epigrams*. Lycophon. *Alexandre*. Trans. A. W. Mair. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.

Aristophanes. *The Acharnians; the Knights; the Clouds; the Wasps*. Trans. Benjamin Bickley Rogers. Vol. I of the *Works* of Aristophanes. Loeb Classical Library. 3 Vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Aristotle. *The "Art" of Rhetoric*. Trans. John Henry Freese. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

________. *The Athenian Constitution; the Eudemian Ethics; On Virtue and Vices*. Trans. H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

________. *De Poetica*. Trans. Ingram Bywater, Vol. XI. *The Works of Aristotle Translated into English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924. Trans. W. Hamilton Fyfe. In volume with Longinus. *De Sublimitate* and Demetrius. *De Elocutione*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambrdige: Harvard University Press, 1932.

________. *Rhetoric and Poetics*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts and Ingram Bywater. Ed. Friedrich Solmsen. New York: Random House, Inc., 1954.

Aristotle. *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*. Trans. with supplementary examples for students of composition and public speaking by Lane Cooper. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1932.

? Athanasius. *The Incarnation of the Word of God*. Trans. A Religious of C.S.M.U., Intro. C. S. Lewis. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946.

Augustine. *The City of God*. "Books IV-VII." Trans. William M. Green. Vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. 7 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

________. *Confessions*. Trans. William Watts. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960-1961.

________. *Christian Instruction*. Trans. John G. Gavigan, Vol. IV of *The Fathers of the Church*. Ed. Ludwig Schopp, et al. 72 vols. New York: Cima Publishing Co., Inc., 1947.

________. *De Doctrina Christiana*. Trans. J. F. Shaw. Ed. Philip Schaff. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1956.

________. *On Christian Doctrine*. Trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1958.

Bede, The Venerable. *Figures of Speech (of the Bible)*, Beda Opera Omnia, in *The Complete Works of Venerable Bede*. Ed. J. A. Giles. Whitaker and Co., London, 1843.

Cicero. *Brutus*. Trans. G. L. Hendrickson. *Orator*. Trans. H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.

________. *De Inventione; De Optimo Genere Oratorum; Topica*. Trans. H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

________. *De Officus*. Trans. C. W. Keyes. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

________. *De Oratore*. "Books I-II." Trans. E. W. Sutton. Intro. H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.

________. *De Oratore*. Trans. J. S. Watson. London: Henry J. Bohn, 1855.

Cicero. *De Re Publica; De Legibus*. Trans. Clinton Walker Keyes. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

________. *Epistolae Ad Familiares*. Trans. W. Glenn Williams. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

________. *Oratory and Orators*. Trans. J. S. Watson. Philadelphia: David Makay, 1897.

________. *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* (Anonymous treatise, formerly attributed to Cicero). Texte revue et traduit par Henri Bornecque Paris: Garnier, N. D. Trans. H. Caplan. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

The Basic Works of Cicero. Ed. Moses Hadas. New York: Random House, 1951.

________. *Tusculan Disputations*. Trans. J. E. King. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Clement of Alexandria. *Stromata*. *The Anti-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. II: *Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria*. Ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. American edition, ed. A. Cleveland Coxe. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

Cyprian, St. *Epistle I, to Donatus*. Trans. Rev. Ernest Wallace. *Vol. V, The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. Ed. Rev. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Demetrius. *De Elocutione*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. In volume with Aristotle's *De Poetica* and Longinus' *De Sublimitate*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.

________. *On Style*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Demosthenes. *Olynthiacs; Philippics; Minor Public Speeches; Speech Against Leptines*. Trans. J. H. Vince. Vol. I of the works of Demosthenes. Loeb Classical Library. 7 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Orations of Demosthenes. Trans. Thomas Leland. New York: The Colonial Press, 1900.

Dio Chrysostom. *Discourses*. "XII-XXX." Trans. J. W. Cohoon. Vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. 5 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

________. *Treatise on the Priesthood*. Trans. Rev. W. R. Stephens. Vol. IX, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Ed. Philip Schaff. 14 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdman's Pub. Co., 1956.

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Trans. R. D. Hicks. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *De Compositione Verborum*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. London: Macmillan and Co., 1910.

Epictetus. *Discourses*. "Books I-II." Trans. W. A. Oldfather. Vol. I. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Eunapius. *The Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists*. Trans. Wilmer Cave. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Euripides. *The Bacchanals; The Madness of Hercules; The Children of Hercules; The Phoenician Maidens; Suppliants*. Trans. Arthur S. Way. Vol. III of the works of Euripides. Loeb Classical Library. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

________. *Ion; Hippolytus; Medea; Alcestis*. Trans. Arthur S. Way. Vol. IV of the works of Euripides. Loeb Classical Library. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.

Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History*. "Books I-V." Trans. Kirsopp Lake. Vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Gorgias. *Encomium of Helen*. Trans. La Rue Van Houk. In *Isocrates*. Vol. IV. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Herodotus. *History*. "Books V-VII." Trans. A. D. Godley. Vol. III. Loeb Classical Library. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf*. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1939.

Horace. Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica. Trans. H. Rushton Fairclough. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

"Hosea," "Amos," and "Micah" in The Holy Bible, King James Version. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1934.

The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments. Translated out of the Original Tongues and with the Former Translations Diligently Compared and Revised, by His Majesty's Special Command Appointed To Be Read in Churches: Authorized King James Version. Oxford: University Press, 1611.

Ignatius. Ephesians. The Apostolic Fathers; A New Translation and Commentary. Vol. IV: Ignatius of Antioch. Ed. Robert M. Grant. Camden: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1966.

Irenaeus. Against Heresies. The Anti-Nicene Fathers. Vol. I. The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus. Ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. American Edition. Ed. A. Cleveland Coxe. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

Isocrates. On the Peace; Areopagiticus; Against the Sophists; Antidosis; Panathenaicus. Trans. George Nolan. Vol. II of the works of Isocrates. Loeb Classical Library. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

_________. To Demonicus; To Nicocles; Nicocles or the Cyprians; Panegyricus; To Philip; Archidamus. Trans. George Nolan. Vol. I of the works of Isocrates. Loeb Classical Library. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Josephus. Jewish Antiquities. "Books XII-XIV " Trans. Ralph Marcus. Vol. VII of the works of Josephus. Loeb Classical Library. 9 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

_________. Jewish Antiquities. "Books XV-XVII." Trans. Ralph Marcus. Ed. Allen Wikgren. Vol. VIII of the works of Josephus. Loeb Classical Library. 9 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

_________. Jewish Antiquities. "Books XVIII-XX." Trans. Louis H. Feldman. Vol. IX of the works of Josephus. Loeb Classical Library. 9 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Josephus. *The Jewish War*. "Books I-III." Trans. H. St. J. Thackeray. Vol. II of the works of Josephus. Loeb Classical Library. 9 vols. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1927.

________. *The Life; Against Apion*. Trans. H. St. J. Thackeray. *Vol. I of the works of* Josephus. Loeb Classical Library. 9 vols. London: William Heinemann, 1926.

Juvenal and Persius. *Saturae*. Trans. G. L. Ramsay. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918.

Livy. *From the Founding of the City*. "Books XLIII-XLIV." Trans. Alfred C. Schlesinger. Vol. XIII. Loeb Classical Library. 14 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

"Longinus." *De Sublimitate*. Trans. W. Hamilton Fyfe. In volume with Demetrius *De Elocutione* and Aristotle *De Poetica*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.

________. *On Great Writing* (On the Sublime). Trans. G. M. A. Grube. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1957.

________. *On the Sublime*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. Cambridge University Press, 1907.

Lucian. *The Passing of Peregrinus; The Runaways; Toxaris, or Friendship; The Dance; Lexiphanes; The Eunuch; Astrology; The Mistaken Critic; The Parliament of the Gods; The Tyrannicide; Disowned*. Trans. A. M. Harmon. *Vol. V of the works of Lucian*. Loeb Classical Library. 8 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.

________. *The Sham Sophist or the Solecist; Lucius or the Ass; Affairs of the Heart; In Praise of Demosthenes; Halcyon; Gout and Swift-of-Foot; The Cynic; The Patriot; Charidemus; Philopatris; Nero; Epigrams*. Trans. M. D. MacLeod. Vol. VIII of the works of Lucian. Loeb Classical Library. 8 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Lucretius. *De Rerum Natura*. Trans. W. H. D. Rouse. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Luther, Martin. *Table Talk*. Trans. William Hazlitt. Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication Society, 1911.

Lysias. Orations. Trans. W. R. M. Lamb. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

The Mishnah. Trans. Herbert Danby. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1933.

Pausanias. Description of Greece. "Books I-II." Trans. W. H. S. Jones. Vol. I. Loeb Classical Library. 4 vols., with a companion volume. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

________. Description of Greece. "Books III-IV." Trans. W. H. S. Jones and H. A. Ormerod. Vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. 4 vols., with a companion volume. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.

Petronius. Satyricon. Trans. Micahel Heseltine. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913. Tran. ascribed to Oscar Wilde, privately printed, 1930.

Philo. The Embassy to Gaius. Trans. F. H. Colson. Vol. X of the works of Philo. Loeb Classical Library. 10 vols., and 2 supplementary vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

________. Every Good Man Is Free; On the Contemplative Life or Suppliants; On the Eternity of the World; Flaccus; Hypothetica; On Providence. Trans. F. H. Colson. Vol. IX of the works of Philo. Loeb Classical Library. 10 vols., and 2 supplementary vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

________. On Abraham; On Joseph; Moses. Trans. F. H. Colson. Vol. VI of the works of Philo. Loeb Classical Library. 10 vols., and 2 supplementary vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

________. On the Decalogue; On the Special Laws. "Books I-III." Trans. F. H. Colson. Vol. VII of the works of Philo. Loeb Classical Library. 10 vols., and 2 supplementary vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Philostratus. The Life of Apollonius of Tyana. Trans. F. C C. Conybeare. Vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

________, and Eunapius. The Lives of the Sophists. Trans. Wilmer Cave. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Plato. *Charmides; Alcibiades I and II; Hipparchus; The Lovers; Theages; Minos; Epinomis*. Trans. W. R. M. Lamb. Vol. VIII of the works of Plato. Loeb Classical Library. 12 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.

________. *Euthyphro; Apology; Crio; Phaedo; Phaedrus*. Trans. Harold North Fowler. Vol. I of the works of Plato. Loeb Classical Library. 12 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

________. *Laws*: "Books VII-XII." Trans. R. G. Bury. Vol. X of the works of Plato. Loeb Classical Library. 12 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

________. *Lysis; Symposium; Gorgias*. Trans. W. R. M. Lamb. Vol. V of the works of Plato. Loeb Classical Library. 12 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

________. *Sophist*. Trans. H. N. Fowler. New York: G. O. Putnam's Sons, 1928.

________. *The Statesman; Philebus*. Trans. Harold N. Fowler. *Ion*. Trans. W. R. M. Lamb. Vol. III of the works of Plato. Loeb Classical Library. 12 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

________. *Timaeus; Critias; Cleitophon; Menexenus; Epistles*. Trans. R. G. Bury. Vol. VII of the works of Plato. Loeb Classical Library. 12 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Pliny. *Letters*. "Books I-VI." Trans. William Melmoth, 1915. Rev. W. M. L. Hutchinson. Vol. I. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

________. *Natural History*. "Books III-VII." Trans. R. Rackham. Vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. 10 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Plutarch. *The Contradictions of the Stoics*. Trans. E. Smith. Vol. IV of Plutarch's Morals. Rev. William W. Goodwin. Introd. Ralph Waldo Emerson. 5 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1870.

________. *Themistocles and Camillus; Aristides and Cato Major; Cimon and Lucullus*. Trans. Bernadotte Perrin. Vol. II of Plutarch's Lives. Loeb Classical Library. 11 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Plutarch. *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans.* Trans. John Dryden. Rev. Arthur Hugh Clough. The Modern Library. New York: Random House, n.d.

Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria.* Trans. H. E. Butler. Trans. H. E. Butler. Vol. IV. Loeb Classical Library. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

________. *Institutes of Oratory, or Education of An Orator.* Trans. John Selby Watson. 2 vols. London: Bohn, 1856.

Seneca. *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales.* Trans. Richard M. Gummere. Loeb Classical Library. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

________. *De Beneficiis.* Trans. John W. Basore. Vol. III of Seneca's *Moral Essays.* Loeb Classical Library. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

________, The Elder. *Suasoriae.* Trans. William A. Edward. Cambridge: Cambridge:University Press, 1928.

________. *Suasoriae et Controversiae.* Ed. Adolf Kiessling. Leipzig: Teubner, 1872.

The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, with an English Translation; and with Various Readings and Critical Notes. London: S. Bagster and Sons Limited, n.d.

Sermons of Saint Paul in Acts 13, 17, and 20, in *The Holy Bible,* King James Version. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1934.

Sophocles. *Oedipus the King; Oedipus at Colonus; Antigone.* Trans. F. Storr. Vol. I of the works of Sophocles. Loeb Classical Library. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Strabo. *Geography.* "Books viii-IX." Trans. Horace Leonard Jones. Vol. IV. Loeb Classical Library. 8 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

________. *Geography.* "Books XIII-XIV." Trans. Horace Leonard Jones. Vol. VI. Loeb Classical Library. 8 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Suetonius. *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus.* Trans. J. C. Rolfe. In Suetonius. Vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Tacitus. "A Dialogue on Oratory." The Complete Works of Tacitus. Trans. Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb. New York: The Modern Library, 1942.

________. The Complete Works of Tacitus. Ed. Moses Hadas. New York: Random House, 1942.

________. "Germania," The Complete Works of Tacitus. Trans. Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb. New York: The Modern Library, 1942.

Thucydides. History of the Peloponnesian War. "Books III-IV." Trans. Charles Forster Smith. Vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Xenophon. Memorabilia; Oeconomicus. Trans. E. C. Marchant. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Secondary Sources

Abbott-Smith, G. A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Alexander, Joseph Addison. Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Classic Commentary Library. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1956.

Alford, Henry. The Greek New Testament. Vol. 2. Boston: Lee and Shepherd, 1883.

Anon. "Micah." The Speaker's Bible. Ed. Edward Hastings. Aberdeen, Scotland: Speaker's Bible Offices, n.d.

Bailey, Albert Edward, and Kent, Charles Foster. History of the Hebrew Commonwealth. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

________. History of Israel. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951.

Baird, Craig. Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950.

Baker, George Pierce. The Principles of Argumentation. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1902.

Baker, Gordon P. The Witness of the Prophets. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948.

Baldwin, Charles Sears. *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic*. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959.

________. *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (to 1400), Interpreted from Representative Works*. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959.

________. *The Prophets*. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1927.

Barnes, Albert. *Notes on the New Testament*. Vol. III. London: Blackie and Son, n.d.

Barth, Karl. *Credo*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

________. *The Word of God and the Word of Man*. Trans. Douglas Horton. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1928.

Batten, Loring W. *The Hebrew Prophet*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1905.

Bax, Ernest Belfort. *A Handbook of the History of Philosophy*. London: George Bell & Sons, 1886.

Bendix, Reinhard. *Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1962.

Berger, Peter. *The Precarious Vision*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1961.

Bewer, Julius A. *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*. Vol. I: *Amos, Hosea and Micah. Harper's Annotated Bible*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1949.

Bishop, Eric F. *Apostles of Palestine: The Local Background to the New Testament Church*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.

Bizzell, William B. *The Social Teachings of the Jewish Prophets*. Boston: Sherman, French, 1916.

Black, Edwin. *Rhetorical Criticism; a Study in Method*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.

Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1967.

Blair, Hugh. *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*. London: W. Strahan, T. Cadell in the Strand; and W. Creech, in Edinburgh, 1883.

Blass, F. and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A translation and revision of the ninth-tenth German edition, incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Boak, Arthur E. R. A History of Rome to 565 A.D. 4th ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1955.

Bogardus, Emory S. Fundamentals of Social Psychology. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1931.

Braden, G. W., and Braden, W. W. Public Speaking. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Brigance, William Norwood. Speech: Its Techniques and Discipline in a Free Society. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952.

________. Speech Composition. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1937.

________. The Spoken Word: A Textbook of Speech Compositions. New York: F. S. Crofts and Co., 1927.

Broadus, John A. "The Apostle Paul as a Preacher." Sermons and Addresses. 7th ed. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1886.

________. Lectures on the History of Preaching. New York: Sheldon & Company, 1879.

Brooks, Phillips. Lectures on Preaching. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.

Bruce, Alexander B. St. Paul's Conception of Christianity. New York, 1894.

Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary. London: The Tyndale Press, 1951.

________. The Books and the Parchments. London: Pickering and Ingles, Ltd., 1953.

________. Commentary on the Book of the Acts; The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Ed. Ned B. Stonehouse. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954.

Bruce, F. F. *The Defence of the Gospel in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959.

Bryant, Donald C., Ed. *The Rhetorical Idiom*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1958.

________, and Wallace, Karl R. *Fundamentals of Public Speaking*. 3rd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960.

Buckley, James M. *Extemporaneous Oratory*. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1898.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Burnet, John. *Early Greek Philosophy*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1892.

Burns, A. R. *Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic Empire*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948.

Bury, J. D. *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great*. New York: The Modern Library, 1913.

Cadbury, Henry J. *The Book of Acts in History*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1955.

________. "The Speeches in Acts," in *Additional Notes to the Commentary*. Ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury. Vol. V of *The Beginnings of Christianity*: Part I: *The Acts of the Apostles*. Ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1920-1938.

Caiger, Stephen L. *Lives of the Prophets*. 2nd ed., rev. and enlarged. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1949.

Calkins, Raymond. *The Modern Message of the Minor Prophets*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1947.

Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets*. Vol. II. Trans. John Owen. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1950.

Campbell, George. *Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: W. Strahan; T. Cadell, in the Strand; and W. Creech, in Edinburgh, 1783; copyright by Southern Illinois University Press.

Caplan, Harry. "The Decline of Eloquence at Rome in the First Century," *Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond*. Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1944.

________. "Preaching in the First Century." *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of J. M. Winans*. New York: Century Company, 1925.

Carter, Charles W., and Earl, Ralph. *The Acts of the Apostles*. *The Evangelical Commentary*. Ed. George Allen Turner. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959.

Cave, Sydney. *The Gospel of St. Paul; a Reinterpretation in the Light of the Religion of His Age and Modern Missionary Experience*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928.

Chase, F. H. *Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles*. New York: The Macmillan Company [Prior to 1928].

Church, Brooks Peters. *The Private Lives of the Prophets and the Times in Which They Lived*. New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1953.

Clark, Donald Lemen. *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.

Clarke, Adam. *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments: The Text Carefully Printed from the Most Correct Copies of the Present Authorized Translation, Including the Marginal Readings and Parallel Texts with a Commentary and Critical Notes Designed as a Help to a Better Understanding of the Sacred Writings*. *A New Edition with the Author's Final Corrections*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n.d.

Clarke, M. L. *Rhetoric at Rome; a Historical Survey*. London: Choen & West Ltd., 1953.

Cochrane, Charles Norris. *Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Cohen, Arthur R. *Attitude Change & Social Influence*. With a foreword by Leon Festinger and Philip Zimbardo. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

Cohen, A. *The Twelve Prophets*. Hebrew Text, English translation and commentary. London: Soncino Press, 1948.

Cohon, Beryl D. The Prophets: Their Personalities and Teachings. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1939.

Cohoon, J. W. Dio Chrysostom. Vol. I. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1932.

Conybeare, W. J., and Howson, J. S. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966.

________. The Life, Times and Travels of St. Paul. 2 vols. New York: E. B. Treat and Company; Chicago, Ill.: C. W. Lilly; Philadelphia, Pa.: A. H. Hubbard; Pittsburgh, Pa.: A. L. Talcott and Company, 1869.

Conzelmann, Hans. "The Address of Paul on the Areopagus," Studies in Luke, Acts. Ed. Leander E. Keck and S. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Couch, Herbert N., and Geer, Russel M. Classical Civilization. Vol. I: Greece. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1940. Vol. II: Rome. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950.

Cowan, H. "Nicolaitans," A Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. III: Kir--Pleiades. Ed. James Hastings. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1900.

Davidson, F. The New Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1953.

Deane, W. J. "Introduction to Amos," The Pulpit Commentary. Ed. Spence & Exell. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., n.d.

________. "Introduction to Hosea," The Pulpit Commentary. Ed. Spence & Exell. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., n.d.

________. "Introduction to Micah," The Pulpit Commentary. Ed. Spence & Exell. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., n.d.

Deissman, Adolf. Light from the Ancient East; The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World. Trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910.

________. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History. Trans. William E. Wilson. New York: Harper, 1957.

Dibelius, Martin. Paul. Trans. Frank Clarke. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953.

Dibelius, Martin. *The Message of Jesus Christ; The Tradition of the Early Christian Communities*. Trans. Frederick C. Grant. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939.

Dickens, Milton. *Speech: Dynamic Communication*. 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963.

Dictionary of the Bible. Ed. James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

Dobson, J. A. *The Greek Orators*. London: Methuen & Company, 1919.

Dodd, Charles H. *According to the Scriptures*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

________. "The Epistle of Paul to the Romans," *Moffatt New Testament Commentary*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1932.

________. *Gospel and Law*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

________. *The Meaning of St. Paul for Today*. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1920.

________. *New Testament Studies*. Manchester: The Manchester University Press, 1953.

________. *The Old Testament in the New*. Ed. John Reumann. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963.

Doeve, J. W. *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*. Assen. Netherlands: Van Gorcum and Company, 1954.

Duff, J. W. *A History of Rome from the Origin to the Close of the Golden Age*. London: T. F. Unwin, 1910.

________. *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age from Tiberius to Hadrian*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1927.

Duncan, George S. *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929.

Durand, Alfred. "Inspiration of the Bible," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. 15 vols. New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913.

Eadie, John. *Paul, the Preacher*. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1860.

Easton, Burton Scott. *Early Christianity--The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers*. Ed. Frederick E. Grant. Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1954.

Edersheim, Alfred. *The History of Israel and Judah*. Vol. 7. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1960.

________. *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. 2 vols. New American ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959.

________. *Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ*. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1961.

Edward, William A. *The Suasorine of Seneca the Elder*. Cambridge: University Press, 1928.

Eiselen, Frederick C. *The Minor Prophets*. New York: Eton, 1907.

________. *Prophecy and the Prophets in Their Historical Relations*. Vol. II. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1909.

________. *The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament*. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1923.

Eisenson. *The Psychology of Speech*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1938

Eltester, W. "Schopfungsoffenbarung und Naturliche Theologie im fruhen Christentum," *New Testament Studies*. III, 1956.

Enslin, Morton Scott. *Christian Beginnings*. New York: Harpers, 1938.

Epp, Eldon Jay. *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. Vol. III. *Society for New Testament Studies*. Monograph Series. Ed. Matthew Black. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1966.

Farrar, F. W. *Early Days of Christianity*. London: Cassell, Petter Galpin & Co., 1899.

________. *Life and Letters of St. Paul*. New York: E. P. Dutton Company, 1879.

________. *Life and Work of Paul*. London: Cassell & Company, Ltd., 1908.

Farrar, F. W. The Messages of the Books. London: Macmillan & Co., 1884.

________. The Minor Prophets. New York: A. D. F. Randolph and Company, 1890.

Faus, William A. The Genius of the Prophets. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946.

Feine, Paul, and Behm, Johannes. Introduction to the New Testament. Trans. A. J. Mattell, Jr. Ed. Werner Georg Kummel. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Fisher, George P. The Beginnings of Christianity, with a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ. London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1877.

________. History of the Christian Church. London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1877.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. The Acts of the Apostles; in The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. Ed. James Moffatt. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1931.

________, and Lake, Kirsopp. "The Dispersion." Prolegomena I: The Jewish, Gentile and Christian Backgrounds. Vol. I of The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. Ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1920-1933.

________. The Life of Saint Paul: The Man and the Apostle. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926.

Foerster, Werner. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. II A-H. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Ed. Gerhard Kittel. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdsman Publishing Company, 1964.

Fosbroke, H. E. W. "Amos Introduction," The Interpreter's Bible. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Gardner, Percy. "The Speeches of St. Paul in Acts," in Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day. Ed. Henry Barclay Swete. London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1909.

________. The Religious Experience of St. Paul. London: Williams and Norgate. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1913.

Gartner, Bertil. The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation. Trans. Carolyn Hannay King. Vol. XXI of Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis. Ed. Anton Fridrichsen and Harald Riesenfeld. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1955.

Garvie, Alfred Ernest. The Preachers of the Church. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1926.

________. Studies of Paul and His Gospel. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911.

Gilbert, George Holley. Greek Thought in the New Testament. New York: Macmillan Co., 1928.

Glock, C. Y., and Stark, Richard. Religion and Society in Tension. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965.

Glover, T. R. The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1920.

________. The Mind of St. Paul. London: H. Milford, 1941.

________. Paul of Tarsus. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1930.

________. The World of the New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931.

Gray, Giles W., and Braden, Waldo W. Public Speaking: Principles and Practice. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Grenier, Albert. The Roman Spirit in Religion, Thought, and Art. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1926.

Grube, G. M. A. The Greek and Roman Critics. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1965.

________. Plato's Thought. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.

Guignebert, Ch. The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus. Trans. S. H. Hooke. The History of Civilization. Ed. C. K. Ogden. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1939.

Guilding, Aileen. The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship; A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1960.

Guthrie, D. O. *Factual Communication; A Handbook of American English*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948.

Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction: The Gospels and Acts*. Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1965.

Gwynn, Aubrey. *Roman Education from Cicero to Quintilian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.

Hackett, Horatio B. *A Commentary on the Original Text of the Acts of the Apostles*. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1877.

Hall, G. Stanley. *Jesus The Christ in the Light of Psychology*. New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1917.

Hamilton, Floyd. *The Basis of Christian Faith*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1927.

Harnack, Adolf. *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. Trans. and ed. James Moffatt. New York: G. Putnam's Sons, and London: Williams and Norgate, 1904.

________. I. "St. Luke the Physician," *New Testament Studies*. Trans. Rev. J. R. Wilkinson. London: Williams and Norgate. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1907.

Harper, William R. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea," *The International Critical Commentary*. Ed. S. R. Driver, et al. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1925.

Harrell, Costen J. *The Prophets of Israel*. C. A. Brown, General Editor. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1933.

Hatch, William R. *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usage upon the Christian Church*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1890.

________. *The Pauline Idea of Faith in Its Relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917.

Havelock, Eric. *Preface to Plato*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, n.d.

Havernok, Lewis. *Saul of Tarsus*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.

Hawkins, John C. *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.

Hendriksen, William. *Exposition of the Pastoral Epistles: New Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1957.

Henry, Carl F. H. "Mars Hill and Modern Myths," *Best Sermons*. Vol. X: 1966-1968. Protestant edition. Ed. G. Paul Butler. New York: Trident Press, 1968.

Hofstader, Richard. *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Hort, Fenton John Anthony. *Judaistic Christianity*. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1904.

Howson, J. S. *The Metaphors of St. Paul, and Companions of St. Paul*. Boston: American Tract Society, 1872.

Hunter, Archibald Macbride. *Interpreting Paul's Gospel*. London: Student Christian Movement Press, Ltd., 1954.

Hutton, Richard Holt. "M. Renan's St. Paul," in *Theological Essays*. New York: Macmillan and Company, 1888.

Innes, Kathleen E. *The Bible As Literature*. London: Cape, 1930.

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Ed. James Orr. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1947.

Isserman, Ferdinand. *Moses and the Prophets*. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1935.

________. *Rebels and Saints: The Special Message of the Prophets of Israel*. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1933.

Iverach, James. *St. Paul: His Life and Times*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., n.d.

Jaeger, Werner. *Early Christianity and Greek Paidera*. Cambridge: *The Belknap Press of Harvard University* Press, 1965.

Jebb, R. C. *The Attic Orators*. Vol. I. London: Macmillan and Co., 1876.

________. *The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus*. Vol. II. London: Macmillan & Company, 1893.

Jefferson, Charles Edward. *The Character of Paul*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.

Jewish Encyclopedia. Eds. Cecil Roth and Jeffrey Wigoder. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905.

Jones, Maurice. *St. Paul the Orator; A Critical, Historical and Explanatory Commentary on the Speeches of St. Paul*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910.

Jones, Richard B. *Saul of Tarsus*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1933.

Jordan, W. G. *Prophetic Ideas and Ideals*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1899.

Kelly, William. *Lectures Introductory to the Study of the Minor Prophets*. London: A. S. Rouse, 1906.

Kennedy, George. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Kent, Charles F. *The Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1915.

________. *The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1932.

Kenyon, Sir Frederick. *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1948.

King, Donald. *Religion in Greek Rhetoric*. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1965.

Kinsey, Robert S. *With Paul in Greece*. Nashville, Tennessee: The Parthenon Press, 1957.

Knight, Harold. *The Hebrew Prophetic Consciousness*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1947.

Knowling, Richard John. "The Acts of the Apostles," *The Acts of the Apostles; St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans; St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Vol. II of *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. Ed. W. Robertson Nicoll. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961.

________. *The Testimony of Paul to Christ*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911.

Knox, John. *Chapters in the Life of Paul*. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.

Knudson, Albert C. *The Beacon Lights of Prophecy*. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1916.

Konig, E. "Prophecy (Hebrew)," Vol. X of *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. Ed. James Hastings. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1918.

Kuist, Howard Tillman. *The Pedagogy of St. Paul*. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1925.

Laetech, Theodore, T. D. *The Minor Prophets: Bible Commentary*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956.

Lake, Kirsopp. "The Apostolic Council of Jerusalem," *Additional Notes to the Commentary*. Ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury. Vol. V of *The Beginnings of Christianity; Part I: The Acts of the Apostles*. Ed. F. J. Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1920-1933.

________. "Proselytes and God-fearers," *Additional Notes to the Commentary*. Ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury. Vol. V of *The Beginnings of Christianity; Part I: The Acts of the Apostles*. Ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1920-1933.

________. "The Unknown God," *Additional Notes to the Commentary*. Ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury. Vol. V of *The Beginnings of Christianity; Part I: The Acts of the Apostles*. Ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1920-1933.

________. "'Your Own Poets,'" *Additional Notes to the Commentary*. Ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury. Vol. V of *The Beginnings of Christianity; Part I: The Acts of the Apostles*. Ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1920-1933.

Larrimer, Mary. *The Life of Paul of Tarsus*. Boston: Lothrop, Lee and Shepard Co., 1929.

Laurie, S. S. *Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953.

Lee, Guy, and Mitchell, Carroll. *Orators of the Early and Medieval Church*. Vol. 3 of *The World's Orators*. Ed. Guy C. Lee, Joseph Ayer, and Carroll Mitchell. 6 vols. New York: The Knickerbocker Press, 1901.

Lenski, R. D. H. *The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles*. Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1944.

Leslie, Elmer A. *The Prophets Tell Their Own Story*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1939.

Lewin, Thomas. *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. London: Rivingtons, 1851.

Lovestam, Evald. *Son and Saviour; A Study of Acts 13, 32-37*. With an *Appendix: "Son of God" in the Synoptic Gospels*. Trans. Michael J. Petry. Vol. XVIII of *Coniectanea Neotestamentica*. Ed. by Anton Fridrichsen and Harald Riesenfeld. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961.

Luther, Martin. *Table Talk*. Trans. William Hazlitt. Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication Society [No date given, probably c.1911].

MacDonald, Duncan Black. *The Hebrew Literary Genius*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1933.

Mackay, W. Mackintosh. *The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets*. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1929.

Macpherson, William. *The Psychology of Persuasion*. New York: Methuen and Co., 1920.

Mahaffy, John P. *The Silver Age of the Greek World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1906.

Mathews, William. *Oratory and Orators*. Chicago: S. C. Grogg & Company, 1896.

McBirnie, William. *The Search for the Twelve Apostles*. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House, Publishers, 1973.

McBurney, James H., and Wrage, Earnest J. *The Art of Good Speech*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953.

McClintock, John, and Strong, James, Eds. "Paul," Vol. VII in *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*. New York: Harper & Bros., Publishers, 1877.

McCroskey, James C. *An Introduction to Rhetorical Communication; The Theory and Practice of Public Speaking*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

McCurdy, J. Frederic. "Hosea," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson. Vol. V. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1909.

________. "Micah," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson. Vol. VII. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1910.

McDonald, William A. *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943.

McGarvey, J. W. *New Commentary on Acts of Apostles*. 2 vols. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1892.

McGiffert, Arthur Cushman. *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

Metzger, Bruce M. *Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul*. Vol. I of *New Testament Tools and Studies*. Ed. Bruce M. Metzger. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. "δράω," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. V: Ξ-Πα . Ed. Gerhard Friedrich, Trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967.

Miller, Walter. *Greece and the Greeks*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1941.

Mills, Glen E. *Composing the Speech*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.

Milman, Henry Hart. *The History of Christianity*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1841.

Minnick, Wayne C. *The Art of Persuasion*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958.

Moe, Olaf. *The Apostle Paul: His Life and His Work*. Trans. L. A. Vigness. Minneapolis: Augsbury Publishing House, 1950.

Moe, Olaf. *The Apostle Paul: His Message and Doctrine*. Trans. L. A. Vigness. Minneapolis: Augsbury Publishing House, 1954.

Moffett, R. T., and Johnson, W. H. *Basic Writing*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937.

Monroe, Alan H. *Principles and Types of Speech*. New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1935.

Monroe, Allen, and Ehninger, Douglas. *Principles and Types of Speech*. 6th ed. Dallas: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1967.

Morgan, G. Campbell. *The Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1924.

Morris, Leon. *The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries*. Tyndale Press Monographs. London: The Tyndale Press, 1964.

Morton, H. V. *In the Steps of St. Paul*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1937.

Mouat, L. H. "An Approach to Rhetorical Criticism," *The Rhetorical Idiom*. Ed. Donald C. Bryant. Ithica, New York: Cornell University Press, 1958.

Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. II of *Accidence and Word-Formation*. Ed. Wilbert Francis Howard. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1919.

Munck, Johannes. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. Trans. Frank Clarke. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1959.

Nestle, R. W. *Novum Testamentum Greece*. Ed. Eberhard Nestle. Stuttgart: Privilege Wurtt, 1952; Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1960.

New Standard Bible Dictionary. Ed. William Smith. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1962.

Norden, Eduard. *Die Antike Kunstprosa*. II Leipzig: Verlag B. G. Teubner, 1898.

________. *Agnostos Theos; Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religioser Rede*. Leipzig: Verlag B. G. Teubner, 1913.

Oates, Whitney J. *The Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1957.

Oesterley, W. E. E., and Robinson, T. H. A History of Israel. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951.

Oliver, Robert T. The Psychology of Persuasive Speech. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1942.

________. Training for Effective Speech. New York: Cordon Company, Inc., 1939.

Orchard, William E. Oracles of God. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1922.

Parks, Brother E. Patrick. The Roman Rhetorical Schools As a Preparation for the Courts Under the Early Empire. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1945.

Paton, Lewis B. Outline of a Course of Study for Advanced Classes on the Prophets of Israel and Their Writings. Hartford, Connecticut: Hartford Seminary Press, 1902.

Patterson, John. The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.

Pattison, T. Harwood. The History of Christian Preaching. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1916.

Peabody, Francis Greenwood. The Apostle Paul and the Modern World. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1926.

Perelman, Chaim. "The New Rhetoric," in The Prospect of Rhetoric. Eds. Lloyd F. Bitzer and Edwin Black. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

Pfeiffer, Charles F., and Vos, Howard F. The Wycliffe Historical Geography of Bible Lands. Chicago: Moody Press, 1967.

Pfleiderer, Otto. The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity. The Hibbert Lectures, 1885. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.

Phelps, Austin. The Theory of Preaching. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892.

Phillips, Arthur E. Effective Speaking. Chicago: The Newton Company, 1915.

Phillips, J. B. The Young Church in Action: A Translation of the Acts of the Apostles. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956.

Pickell, Charles N. Preaching to Meet Men's Needs: The Meaning of the Acts as a Guide for Preaching Today. New York: Exposition Press, 1958.

Pickett, Henry J. The Hebrew Prophet and the Modern Preacher. London: Holborn Publishing House, 1922.

Pittman, Randall T. Words and Their Ways in the Greek New Testament. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1942.

Pope, Alexander. The Complete Poetical Works from 1688-1744. New York: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1902.

Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural Dictionary. Ed. Samuel Fallows. Chicago: Howard Severance Co., 1917.

Quayle, William A. The Pastor-Preacher. Cincinnati: Jennings and Graham; New York: Eaton and Mains, 1910.

Rackham, Richard Belward. "The Acts of the Apostles; an Exposition," Westminister Commentaries. Ed. Walter Lock and D. C. Simpson. 14th ed. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1951.

________. "The Acts of the Apostles," Oxford Commentaries. London: Methuen & Company, 1901.

Rall, Harris Franklin. According to Paul. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945.

Ramsay, W. M. The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915.

________. The Church in the Roman Empire Before A.D. 170. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893.

________. The Cities of St. Paul: Their Influence on His Life and Thought. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1908.

________. Historical Commentary on Galatians. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913.

________. Pictures of the Apostolic Church; Studies in the Book of Acts. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1959.

________. St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949.

Ramsay, W. M. The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day. 2nd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914.

Rand, E. K. Founder of the Middle Ages. New York: Dover Publication, Inc., 1928.

"Reading of the Law," The Encyclopedia of the Jewish Religion. Ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and Geoffrey Wigoder. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.

Ricciotti, Giuseppe. The Acts of the Apostles: Text and Commentary. Trans. Laurence E. Byrne. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1958.

________. Paul the Apostle. Trans. Alba Zizzamia. Wisconsin: Bruce Publishing Company, 1953.

Robertson, Archibald T. Epochs in the Life of Paul. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

________. The Glory of the Ministry. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1911.

________. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.

________. Luke the Historian in the Light of Research. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

________. Paul the Interpreter of Christ. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1921.

________. Word Pictures in the New Testament. Vol. III of The Acts of the Apostles. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930.

Robinson, C. E. Everyday Life in Ancient Greece. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Robinson, George L. The Twelve Minor Prophets. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1926.

Robinson, T. H. Prophecy and the Prophets. London: Duckworth, 1948.

Rokeach, Milton. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Ropes, James Hardy. The Apostolic Age in the Light of Modern Criticism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

Rops, Daniel. *Saint Paul, Apostle of Nations*. Trans. Jex Martin. Paris: Fayard, 1952.

Rosenfield, Lawrence W. "The Anatomy of Critical Discourse," *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth-Century Perspective*. Eds. Robert L. Scott and Bernard L. Brock. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972.

Ross, Raymond S. *Speech Communication: Fundamentals and Practice*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Ruch, Floyd L. *Psychology and Life*. Chicago: Scott Foresman & Co., 1948.

Russell, Bertrand. *Mysticism and Logic*. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1949.

Sandford, William P., and Yeager, Willard H. *Principles of Effective Speaking*. 5th ed. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1950.

Sandmel, Samuel. *The Genius of Paul: A Study in History*. New York: Farrar, Strauss & Cudahby, 1958.

________. *A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament*. Cincinnati: The Hebrew Union College Press, 1956.

Sarett, Alma Johnson; Sarett, Lew; and Foster, William Trufant. *Basic Principles of Speech*. Ed. Wayne E. Minnick. 4th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

Saunders, Dero A., Ed. *The Portable Gibbon: The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. New York: The Viking Press, 1957.

Schenck, Ferdinand S. *The Oratory and Poetry of the Bible*. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915.

Schniewind, Julius. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Ed. Gerhard Kittel. Trans. and Ed. Geoffrey A. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.

Schroeder, Frederick W. *Preaching the Word with Authority*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.

Schubert, Paul. "The Place of the Areopagus Speech in the Composition of Acts," *Transitions in Biblical Scholarship*. Ed. J. Coert Ryllaradam. Vol. I of *Essays in Divinity*. Ed. Gerald C. Brauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Schurer, Emil. *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. Second Division of *The Internal Condition of Palestine, and of the Jewish People, in the Time of Jesus Christ*. Trans. Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.

Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Trans. William Montgomery. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1931.

Schweizer, Eduard. "The Concept of the Davidic 'Son of God' in Acts and Its Old Testament Background," *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Sclater, J. R. P. *The Public Worship of God*. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1927.

Scott, Charles Archibald Anderson. *Christianity According to St. Paul*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1957.

________. "Jesus and Paul," in *Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day*. Ed. Henry Barclay Swete. London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1927.

________. *St. Paul, the Man and the Teacher*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1936.

Scott, Walter D. *The Psychology of Public Speaking*. Philadelphia: Pearson Brothers, 1907.

Sears, Lorenzo. *Orators of Ancient Greece*. Ed. Guy Carleton Lee and Mitchell Carroll, Vol. I. *Orators of Ancient Rome*. Ed. Guy Carleton Lee and Joseph Cullen Ayer, Vol. II. *Oratory of the Ancient and Medieval Church*. Ed. Guy Carleton Lee, Joseph Cullen Ayer, Mitchell Carroll, Vol. III. *The World's Orators*. Ed. Guy Carleton Lee. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901.

Sienkiewicz, H. R. *Quo Vadis?* (Whither Goest Thou?) Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1896-1925.

Silver, Hillel. *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel from the First through the Seventeenth Centuries*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Smith, David. *The Life and Letters of St. Paul*. New York: Harper & Brothers, n.d.

Smith, George A. The Book of the Twelve Prophets. Vol. I of Amos, Hosea and Micah. The Expositor's Bible. Ed. W. R. Nicholl. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1905.

________. Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1901.

Smith, H. P. Old Testament History. International Theological Library. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

Smith, J. M. P. The Prophet and His Problem. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1914.

Smith, Wilbur M. Therefore, Stand; A Plea for a Vigorous Apologetic in the Present Crisis of Evangelical Christianity. Chicago: Moody Press, 1945.

Smith, W. Robertson. The Prophets of Israel. 2nd ed. London: A. C. Black, 1897.

Snaith, Norman H. The Book of Amos. 2 vols. London: Epworth Press, 1946.

________. Mercy and Sacrifice: A Study in the Book of Hosea. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1953.

Soares, Theodore Gerald. The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.

Stalker, James. The Life of St. Paul. Rpt. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1950.

________. The Preacher and His Models. Yale Lectures on Preaching, 1891. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1891.

Steinmuller, John E. A Companion to Scripture Studies: Special Introduction to the New Testament. New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., n.d.

Stevens, George Baker. Theology of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Stewart, James. A Man in Christ. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

Stier, Rudolf. The Words of the Apostles. Trans. from the 2nd German ed. by G. H. Venables. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1869.

Stonehouse, H. D. "The Areopagus Address," *Paul Before the Areopagus and Other New Testament Studies*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.

Streeter, B. H. *The God Who Speaks*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936.

Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans. New York: The Century Company, 1925.

Tholuck, A. *Remarks on the Life, Character, and Style of the Apostle Paul*. Edinburgh: Thomas Clark, 1840.

Thompson, Wayne N., and Fessenden, Seth A. *Basic Experiences in Speech*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1958.

Thonssen, Lester, Ed. *Selected Readings in Rhetoric and Public Speaking*. New York: The H. W. Wilson Co., 1942.

________; Baird, A. Craig; and Braden, Waldo W. *Speech Criticism*. 2nd ed. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1970.

________, and Baird, A. Craig. *Speech Criticism; The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal*. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948.

________; Fatherson, Elizabeth; and Thonssen, Dorothea, Eds. *Bibliography of Speech Education*. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1950.

________, and Scanlan, Ross. *Speech Preparation and Delivery*. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1942.

Thorndyke, Ashley H. *Modern Eloquence*. New York: Modern Eloquence Corporation, 1928.

Tipple, Ezra S. *Francis Asbury, the Prophet of the Long Road*. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1916.

Trench, Richard Chenevix. *Synonyms of the New Testament*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1880.

Troland, Leonard T. *The Fundamentals of Human Motivation*. Chicago: Scott Foresman & Co., 1965.

Van Unnik, W. C. *Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth*. Trans. George Ogg. London: The Epworth Press, 1962.

Vincent, Marvin R. Word Studies in the New Testament. 1887 Rpt. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969.

Vine, W. E. An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words with Their Precise Meanings for English Readers. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1940.

Weatherspoon, Jesse Burton. Sent Forth to Preach; Studies in Apostolic Preaching. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.

Weaver, Andrew; Borchers, Gladys; and Smith, Donald. The Teaching of Speech. New York: Macmillan Co., 1956.

________. Speech: Forms and Principles. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1951.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language. Unabridged. Ed. Philip Babcock Gove. Springfield, Mass.: G. C. Merriam Company, Publishers, 1967.

Weiss, Johannes. Earliest Christianity; A History of the Period A.D. 30-150. Trans. and ed. Frederick C. Grant. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Weizsacker, Karl von. The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church. Trans. James Miller. Vol. I. London: Williams and Norgate; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1897.

Whately, Richard. Elements of Rhetoric: Comprising an Analysis of the Laws of MOral Evidence and of Persuasion, with Rules for Argumentative Composition and Elocution. New ed. Rev. by Author. New York: Sheldon & Company, 1869.

Wilchens, Herbert A. "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans. New York: The Century Co., 1925; also in Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth-Century Perspective. Eds. Robert L. Scott and Bernard L. Brock. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972.

Wigmore, John H. The Science of Judicial Proof. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1937.

Wilcox, Max. The Semitisms of Acts. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1965.

Wild, Laura H. A Literary Guide to the Bible. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1922.

Wilder, Amos N. Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Wilkinson, William Cleaver. Paul and the Revolt Against Him. Boston: The Griffith and Rowland Press, 1914.

________. "Paul," Modern Masters of Pulpit Discourse. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905.

Willett, Herbert L. The Prophets of Israel. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1899-1916.

Williams, C. S. C. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Ed. Henry Chadwick. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1957.

Williams, Walter G. The Prophets: Pioneers to Christianity. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Winans, James A., and Hudson, Hoyt H. A First Course in Public Speaking. New York: The Century Co., 1931.

________. Public Speaking. Rev. ed. New York: The Century Company, 1925.

________. Speech Making. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1938.

Woffron, P. A. Who Was Saul of Tarsus? New York: E. B. Treat & Company, 1958.

Wolfe, Rolland E. Meet Amos and Hosea. New York: Harper & Bros., 1945.

________. "Micah Introduction," The Interpreter's Bible. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Wolfendale, James. Homiletical Commentary on the Minor Prophets. London: Richard Dickinson, 1879.

Articles in Journals

Andersen, Kenneth, and Clevenger, Theodore, Jr. "A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos." Speech Monographs, 30 (June 1963), 59-78.

Anon. "Review for Religions." *The Religious Review*, 8 (July, 1949), 49, 50.

Baird, A. Craig, and Thonssen, Lester. "Methodology in the Criticism of Public Address." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 33 (April, 1947), 134-138.

Baskerville, Barnet. "Emerson As a Critic on Oratory." *Southern Speech Journal*, 18 (March, 1953), 150-162.

Berger, Peter L. "Charisma and Religious Innovations; Social Location of Israelite Prophecy." *The American Sociological Review*, 28 (1963), 11-14.

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, I (1968), 1-14.

Black, Edwin. "Plato's View of Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 44 (December, 1958), 361-374.

Blau, Joseph L. "Public Address as Intellectual Revelation." *Western Speech*, 21 (Spring, 1957), 114-116.

Bowker, J. W. "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yellammedenu Form." *New Testament Studies*, 14 (October, 1957), 96-111.

Box, George P. "Essential Attributes of the Concept of Charisma." *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 41 (Spring, 1976), 361-365.

Brandenburg, Earnest. "Quintilian and the Good Orator." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 34 (1948), 23-26.

Broneer, Oscar. "Athens: City of Idol Worship." *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 21 (February, 1958), 2-28.

Bryant, Donald C. "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 39 (December, 1953), 401-424.

Cadbury, Henry J. "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts: I." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 44 (1925), 214-227.

Caplan, Harry, and King, Henry H. "Pulpit Eloquence: A List of Doctrinal and Historical Studies in English." *Speech Monographs*, 22 (Special Issue 1955), 18-123, 159.

Clark, Donald Lemen. "Imitation: Theory and Practice in Roman Education." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 38 (1952), 11-15.

Collins, G. Rowland. "The Relative Effectiveness of the Condensed and Extended Motive Appeal." The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, 10 (June, 1924), 221-230.

Constantelos, Demetrios J. "Vassilios X. Joannides on Paul and the Stoic Philosophers." Anglican Theological Review, 42 (January, 1960), 18-28.

Croft, A. J. "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 42 (October, 1956), 283-291.

Curtius, Ernst. "St. Paul in Athens." Trans. A. E. N. Simms. The Expositor, 7th Series, 4 (November, 1907), 436-55.

Darnell, Donald K. "The Relation Between Sentence Order and Comprehension." Speech Monographs, 30 (June, 1963), 97-100.

Davidson, A. B. "'They That Fear the Lord.'" The Expository Times, 3 (1891-1892), 491.

Dewailly, L. M. New Testament Abstracts, 10 (1965), 53-54.

Eutychus, Edmund P. Clowney. "Jesus and Anastasia." Christianity Today, 27 (March, 1961), 13.

Evans, C. F. "The Kerygma." The Journal of Theological Studies, 7 (April, 1956), 25-41.

Fiedler, Leslie. "In the Beginning Was the Word: Logos or Mythos?" Sewanee Review, 43 (Summer, 1955), 409.

Glasser, Arthur F. "The World Needs a Message." Eternity, July, 1967, pp. 34-36.

Goldsmith, Dale. "Critical Notes: Acts 13:33-37; A Pesher on II Samuel 7." The Journal of Biblical Literature, 87 (1968), 324-326.

Goodrich, Lawrence D. "Chrysostom, 'King of Preachers,'" The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 24 (1953), 27-29.

Graham, Gladys M. "The Natural Procedure in Argument." The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, 11 (November, 1925), 319-337.

Gray, Giles W. Index to the Quarterly Journal of Speech (1915-1954). Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1956.

Hackett, H. B. "The Discourse of Paul at Athens; A Commentary on Acts 17:16-34." *Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Review*, 2 (May, 1949), 346-348.

Harris, J. Rendel. "The Cretans Always Liars." *The Expositor*, 7th Series, 2 (October, 1906), 305-317.

________. "A Further Note on the Cretans." *The Expositor*, 7th Series, 3 (April, 1907), 332-337.

________. "Once More the Cretans." *The Expositor*, 8th Series, 9 (January, 1915), 29-35.

________. "St. Paul and Epimenides." *The Expositor*, 8th Series, 4 (October, 1912), 348-353.

Hartman, L . "David's Son Apropa Acta 13:16-41." *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok*, 28 (1963-64), 117, 134.

Holland, Virginia. "Rhetorical Criticism: A Burkeian Method." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 39 (December, 1953), 444-448.

Hudson, Hoyt H. "The Field of Rhetoric." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*, 9 (April, 1923), 167-180.

Hunsaker, David M., and Smith, Craig R. "The Nature of Issues: A Constructive Approach to Situational Rhetoric." *Western Speech Communication*, 40 (Summer, 1976), 155-156.

Hunt, Everett Lee. "Plato on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 6 (April, 1920), 20-24.

Isho'dad of Merv. *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Trans. and ed. Margaret Dunlop Gibson, in *Horae Semiticae*, 10, 1913, quoted by Rendel Harris. "St. Paul and Epimenides." *The Expositor*, 8 (October, 1912), 352.

Jamieson, Kathleen. "The Rhetorical Manifestations of Weltanschauung." *Central States Speech Journal*, 27 (Spring, 1976), 4, 5.

Jennrick, Walter A. "Classical Rhetoric in the New Testament." *The Classical Journal*, 44 (October, 1948), 30-31.

Knower, Franklin H., Ed. *Table of Contents of the Quarterly Journal of Speech (1915-1948) and Speech Monographs (1934-1948)*. University of Missouri: Speech Association of America, 1949.

Lane, William L. "I Tim. IV:1-3. An Early Instance of Over-Realized Eschatology?" New Testament Studies, 11 (January, 1964), 166-68.

Lee, Irving J. "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal in Rhetorical Theory." Speech Monographs, 6 (1939), 85-87.

Mare, W. H. "Pauline Appeals to Historical Evidence." Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society, 11 (Summer, 1968), 121-30.

Matlon, Ronald J., and Matlon, Irene R., Eds. The Table of Contents and Index of Quarterly Journal of Speech, (1952-1969). Southern Speech Journal (1935-1969). Western Speech Journal (1937-1969). Central States Speech Journal (1949-1969). And Today's Speech (1953-1969). New York: Published by Speech Communication Association, 1971.

Mecklin, H. M. "Paul in Athens." The Bible Student, 6 (February, 1903), 81-84.

Moellering, W. Armin. "Deisidaimonia, a Footnote to Acts 17:28." Concordia Theological Monthly, 34 (August, 1963), 466-471.

Murphy, Richard. "The Speech As a Literary Genre." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 44 (April, 1958), 117-127.

Nestle, Eberhard. "Contributions and Comments: Acts xvii. 22." The Expository Times, 11 (1899-1900), 378-380.

"Notes of Recent Exposition." The Expository Times, 12 (1900-1901), 529-535; 28 (August, 1907), 481-487; 20 (November, 1908), 49-55; 25 (May 1914), 337-342; 64 (May, 1963), 225-228.

Nilsen, Thomas R. "Interpretive Function of the Critic." Western Speech, 21 (Spring, 1957), 75-78.

Oliver, Robert T. "Human Motivation: Intellectuality, Emotionality, and Rationalization." The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, 22 (February, 1936), 67-77.

Phillips, Gerald M. "The Practice of Rhetoric at Talmudic Academies." Speech Monographs, 26 (March, 1959), 37-46.

Redding, W. Charles. "Extrinsic and Intrinsic Criticism." Western Speech, 21 (Spring, 1957), 102-105.

Sattler, William M. "Some Platonic Influences in the Rhetorical Works of Cicero." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 35 (April, 1949), 164-169.

Sedgwick, W. B. "The Origins of the Sermons." The Hibbard Journal, 45 (1946-1947), 159-161.

Sharp, Harry, Jr., and McClung, Thomas. "Effects of Organization on the Speaker's Ethos." Speech Monographs, 33 (June, 1966), 182-183.

Smith, Raymond G. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Speech Organization upon Attitudes of College Students." Speech Monographs, 18 (November, 1951), 292-301.

Smith, Ritchie J. "The Speeches of Paul in Acts." The Bible Student, New Series, 7 (April, 1903), 202-205.

Swartz, Joel. "The Eloquence of St. Paul." The Quarterly Review, New Series, 2 (July, 1872), 426-432.

Taylor, Vernon L. "The Classical Approach to Homiletics." The Pulpit, 32 (September, 1961), 24-28.

Thistlethwaite, Donald L.; deHaan, Henry; and Kamenetzky, Joseph. "The Effects of 'Directive' and 'Non-directive' Communication Procedures on Attitudes." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51 (1955), 24-28.

Thompson, Ernest. "An Experimental Investigation of the Relative Effectiveness of Organizational Structure in Oral Communication." Southern Speech Journal, 26 (Fall, 1960), 59-69.

Woolbert, Charles H. "The Place of Logic in a System of Persuasion." The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, 4 (January, 1918), 18-24.

Wycherley, R. E. "St. Paul at Athens." The Journal of Theological Studies, 19 (October, 1968), 619-21.

Unpublished Material

Cloonan, Benignus. "The Effect of Classical Rhetoric Upon Christian Preaching During the First Five Centuries A.D." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1959.